

---

---

# THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

*Published by the National Association of Biblical  
Instructors to Foster Religion in Education*

---

VOLUME XV

July, 1947

NUMBER 3

---

|  |                      |     |
|--|----------------------|-----|
| CONSERVATION AND REVISION (AN EDITORIAL).....      | Carl E. Purinton     | 131 |
| REASON IN RELIGION.....                            | William H. Bernhardt | 133 |
| LIBERALISM AND THE CHALLENGE OF NEO-ORTHODOXY..... | Robert M. Montgomery | 139 |

## *A Symposium: Biblical Theology and the Higher Criticism*

|   |                       |     |
|---|-----------------------|-----|
| THE TERMINOLOGY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.....   | Rolland Emerson Wolfe | 143 |
| HIGHER CRITICISM AND BIBLICAL PROBLEMS..... | Ira Jay Martin        | 148 |
| THE PROBLEM OF THE TEACHER.....             | Eugene S. Ashton      | 153 |

## *A Symposium on Biblical Exposition*

|  |                  |     |
|--|------------------|-----|
| AN EXPOSITION OF AN OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGE..... | Robert C. Dentan | 158 |
| AN EXPOSITION OF THE BEATITUDES.....           | John Wick Bowman | 162 |

### RESEARCH ABSTRACTS:

|   |                    |     |
|---|--------------------|-----|
| RESEARCH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT (1946)..... | Robert H. Pfeiffer | 171 |
|---|--------------------|-----|

### BOOK REVIEWS:

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| SWEET, WILLIAM WARREN, RELIGION ON THE AMERICAN FRONTIER, 1783-1840. VOL. IV.<br>METHODISTS..... |  | 174 |
| THE By John T. McNeill   |  |     |
| ROTH, CECIL, THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS OF ITALY.....   |  | 175 |
| By Eugene S. Tanner  |  |     |
| BROWNE, LEWIS, THE WORLD'S GREAT SCRIPTURES.....   |  | 176 |
| By S. Vernon McCasland   |  |     |
| BACH, MARCUS, THEY HAVE FOUND A FAITH.....   |  | 177 |
| By Charles S. Braden   |  |     |
| GALLAGHER, BUELL G., COLOR AND CONSCIENCE.....   |  | 178 |
| By Vernon P. Bodein  |  |     |
| BOISEN, ANTON T., PROBLEMS IN RELIGION AND LIFE.....   |  | 180 |
| By John Gardner  |  |     |
| MORGAN, ARTHUR E., NOWHERE WAS SOMEWHERE.....  |  | 180 |
| By David Wesley Soper  |  |     |
| HAZELTON, ROGER, THE GOD WE WORSHIP.....   |  | 181 |
| By Prentiss L. Pemberton   |  |     |
| CRAIG, SAMUEL G., CHRISTIANITY RIGHTLY SO CALLED.....  |  | 182 |
| By L. Harold DeWolf  |  |     |
| CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM.....                             |  | 183 |
| By William H. Bernhardt  |  |     |
| HENRY, CARL F. H., REMAKING THE MODERN MIND.....   |  | 184 |
| By David Wesley Soper  |  |     |
| BRETTALL, ROBERT, A KIERKEGAARD ANTHOLOGY.....   |  | 185 |
| By Paul E. Johnson   |  |     |
| DUMMELOW, J. R. (EDITOR), THE ONE VOLUME BIBLE COMMENTARY.....                                   |  | 186 |
| By Dwight Marion Beck  |  |     |
| GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., HOW TO READ THE BIBLE.....  |  | 187 |
| By F. Wilbur Gingrich  |  |     |
| HYATT, J. PHILIP, PROPHECIC RELIGION.....  |  | 188 |
| By Fleming James   |  |     |
| MARTIN, A. D., A PLAIN MAN'S LIFE OF CHRIST.....   |  | 189 |
| By Carl E. Purinton  |  |     |
| METZGER, BRUCE M., LEXICAL AIDS FOR STUDENTS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.....                         |  | 189 |
| By F. Wilbur Gingrich  |  |     |
| FALLAW, WESNER, THE MODERN PARENT AND THE TEACHING CHURCH.....                                   |  | 190 |
| VIETH, PAUL H., THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.....  |  | 190 |
| MOEHLMAN, CONRAD H., THE CHURCH AS EDUCATOR.....   |  | 190 |
| By J. Paul Williams  |  |     |

(Continued on page 192)

---

---

# THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

EDITOR: CARL E. PURINTON, *Boston University*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: JOHN W. FLIGHT, *Haverford College*

RESEARCH EDITOR: J. PAUL WILLIAMS, *Mount Holyoke College*

EDITOR EMERITUS: ISMAR J. PERITZ, *Syracuse University*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MARY E. ANDREWS, *Goucher College*

JOHN W. BAILEY, *Berkeley Baptist Divinity School*

EDNA M. BAXTER, *Hartford Seminary Foundation*

JOHN W. BOWMAN, *San Francisco Theological Seminary*

CHARLES S. BRADEN, *Northwestern University*

MURIEL S. CURTIS, *Wellesley College*

GEORGE DAHL, *Yale University*

J. PHILIP HYATT, *Vanderbilt University*

ALBION ROY KING, *Cornell College*

ELMER W. K. MOULD, *Elmira College*

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, *Harvard University*

The Journal is the official organ of the National Association of Biblical Instructors and is published at Mt. Royal & Guilford Avenues, Baltimore 2, Maryland.

The annual membership fee including subscription to the JOURNAL is three dollars and fifty cents. Membership in the Association is open to those professionally engaged in the field of Bible and Religion, and to others specially recommended as qualified by the Executive Council.

Subscription to the JOURNAL at three dollars and fifty cents annually is open to all interested in the objects of the Association and its JOURNAL. The price of individual copies is 90¢.

Communications for the Editor, manuscripts, and books for review should be addressed to Prof. Carl E. Purinton, Editor, Boston University College of Liberal Arts, 688 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass.

Applications for membership in the Association, subscriptions to the JOURNAL, and changes of address should be sent to Professor Louis W. Norris, Treasurer, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1947

President: ROLLAND E. WOLFE, *Western Reserve University*

Vice-President: JOHN A. HUTCHISON, *The College of Wooster*

Recording Secretary: MARY F. THELEN, *Hollins College*

Treasurer: LOUIS W. NORRIS, *DePauw University*

Associates in Council: MARY E. ANDREWS, *Goucher College*, 1947; AMOS N. WILDER, *Chicago Theological Seminary*, 1947-48; S. VERNON McCASLAND, *The University of Virginia*, 1947-49

Corresponding Secretary and Program Chairman: JANNETTE E. NEWHALL, *Andover Hall*, Francis Avenue, Cambridge 38, Mass.

## MID-WESTERN BRANCH

President: HORACE T. HOUF, *Ohio University*

Vice-President: EDWARD P. BLAIR, *Garrett Biblical Institute*

Secretary: WILLIAM E. HUNTER, 214 West 52d Street, Chicago, Ill.

Program Chairman: LOWELL B. HAZZARD, *Illinois Wesleyan University*

Associates in Council: PAUL E. DAVIES, *McCormick Seminary*, 1947; CHARLES F. KRAFT, *DePauw University*, 1947-48; NORMAN B. JOHNSON, *Knox College*, 1947-49

Published in January, April, July, and October by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, Mt. Royal & Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Maryland. Editorial Office: Boston University College of Liberal Arts, 688 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass. The subscription price is \$3.50 per annum. Single copies, 90 cents. Entered as second-class matter May 15, 1946, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland under the Act of August 24, 1912.

# THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

Vol. XV

July, 1947

No. 3

## Conservation and Revision

CARL E. PURINTON\*

A COMPARISON of the current year's NABI programs with last year's seems to reveal an Hegelian dialectic at work! The thesis, stated last year both in New York and Chicago, was a call for a return to orthodoxy, stated in neo-orthodox as well as in traditional terms. The antithesis may be found in this year's programs which contained a reaffirmation of faith in the viewpoint of liberalism. Perhaps it is time to begin to think about a synthesis.

A suggestion of the present need may be inferred from a quotation which appeared recently in a syndicated column in our newspapers. Professor A. N. Whitehead was quoted as saying that "the art of a free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code and, secondly, in fearlessness of revision to secure that the code serves those purposes which satisfy an enlightened reason." This quotation was used by the columnist as an argument for the two party system in politics. May we not, however, find an application in the religious field as well? Do we not need to find a balance between the conservative emphasis upon the values of tradition and the liberal concern for a criticism of and an advance beyond the *status quo*, between *conservation* and *revision*?

The conservative trend, if it be interpreted as a desire for the conservation of religious values, clearly corresponds to a need of present-day life. Teachers of religion have been aware of this need for some time. Several years ago the question of the relative emphasis

to be placed upon criticism *versus* appreciation was the subject of an inquiry reported in this Journal. At that time a definite trend toward a greater emphasis upon religious appreciation within the precincts of the academic classroom was observable.

The experience of teaching religion in the post-war period confirms the wisdom of this emphasis. A considerable number of returned veterans profess a deepened interest in religion as a result of war experiences. Some of them are seriously considering entrance upon a religious vocation. Others wish at least to follow through in some systematic way religious interests aroused during war time. One Jewish war veteran who had been stationed in India and had discovered centuries-old Jewish synagogues in that land of venerable religious traditions came home to America with a desire to know more about himself religiously as a Jew. Others are vitally concerned to clarify religious confusions, like the student last fall who referred in a letter to his instructor to "this fierce little inner war of mine." An ex-Wave writes in similarly autobiographical vein, "we all need something to guide us, something in which to have faith."

Perhaps even more significant than statements made to a teacher of religion by students electing religion courses and presumably consciously aware of certain religious needs are the implications of a letter printed in the forum column of the undergraduate newspaper of the campus from which I have myself recently gone. The letter expresses the dissatisfaction of a returned service man with

\*CARL E. PURINTON is Professor of Religion in Boston University and Editor of this Journal.

the total program of education and, while making no specific reference to religion, has definite religious overtones. "I feel that there is a terrible lack of purpose in it all. The majority of instructors seem to feel that we are here solely to get a degree or just because we have nothing else to do, and teach their subjects accordingly. Why don't they show us what their field has done to their lives, how it has influenced them, so we (will) study it? Why don't they help study it? Why don't they help us to learn to live?"

The need expressed in these words is essentially a religious one. It is also typical of a need felt by an increasingly large number of people living in our modern world. Furthermore, it is a need of something which religion has in the past been able to provide. It is the need of a convincing answer to the question of life's ultimate meaning. It is this word that contemporary theology, with its emphasis upon the conservation of religious values, is trying to speak. Liberalism and conservatism alike share the desire to help meet this need.

There are, however, dangers in the trend toward conservatism. One of them, and the only one of which I shall speak in this limited space, is that of a return to a purely individualistic interpretation of religion and the adoption of a strategy of withdrawal from the great ethical and social issues of the day. This in a period when nothing is so much needed in the world of practical affairs as a lively sense of brotherhood or community. It is the liberal theologian who has insisted that Christianity must come to grips with the social order and this liberal emphasis is as greatly needed as ever.

Perhaps a qualification is in order at this point with reference to the leadership of the so-called neo-orthodox trend. The Swedish writer, George Hammar, in his book, *Christian Realism in Contemporary American Theology*, calls attention to the fact that the realistic trend in the thinking of Reinhold Niebuhr arose as a concern for social ethics growing out

of the experience of living and preaching in the great industrial center of Detroit. In this way, according to Hammar, the social gospel became "the starting-point for a new development of American theology." While this seems to be true of the leadership of this movement, one may wonder whether young ministers trained in neo-orthodox circles will reflect an equal concern for the social application of the Christian message.

In the world in which we are living, it will not do to minimize the social message of Christianity. Walter Rauschenbusch and the social gospel so closely connected with his name still have a great contribution to make, provided that the "social gospel" be kept free of the sentimentalism and easy optimism which once surrounded it in the minds of some of its followers. It is a rewarding experience to read again the story of Rauschenbusch's experiences in a little German Baptist church in the tenement district of New York and to see how he was compelled to re-think Christianity out of the purely individualistic framework in which he had been brought up into the social conception to which he gave expression. The present writer's experience of living in a settlement house in the South End of Boston during recent months has given him an inkling of the irrelevance of a kind of religion which establishes no connection with the conditions under which masses of people live today.

Professor Badé once commented upon the difficulty of maintaining the balance between the dogmatic and the ethical elements of religion, remarking that "the orthodox usually take the dogma and the heretics the ethics." This cleavage we need to avoid in present-day religious life and thought. We need a deepening of personal religious life. At the same time, we desperately need a quickened sense of the social relevance of Christianity. We need both depth and breadth. We need the *conservation* of personal religious values and also the capacity for *revision* in our relationship to social and international life.



# Reason in Religion

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT\*

RELIGIOUS behavior may be analysed into three essential elements: function, interpretation, and technique. The first refers to the purposes, goals, aims or ends of human welfare which produced it and which justify its continued existence. The second, or interpretation, refers to the meanings or secondary interpretations placed upon the Reality or realities which constitute the objective pole of such behavior. The third, or technique, consists in the overt behaviors of individuals and groups whereby the values involved are presumably obtained. Religion, in other words, is a complex form of individual and group behavior whereby certain values are realized in terms of techniques oriented toward that in one's existential medium which is interpreted to be divine. If one were to discuss the significance of reason in religion, it is obvious that he must consider its relevance to each of these three phases. We shall have to content ourselves, for the present, with an analysis of a few limited problems in these several areas.

The word "reason" has a long and rather involved history. We shall not attempt to trace this history, nor shall we attempt a positive definition of the term. Instead, we shall define its extension by noting what is excluded. To do this, I wish to present a new term, *metanoesis*, which may be defined positively, and which will serve as the antithesis of reason. The word is formed from two Greek derivatives. The first is *meta*, which means, among other things, "after" or "other than." The second is *noesis*, which means rational thought. *Metanoesis* may be defined as the attempt to arrive at reliable knowledge by other than normal, natural or

rational means. It is employed to denote the whole complex of methods whereby individuals and groups have sought to find answers to questions by extra-rational or supernatural means.

## I

The history of mankind's religious behavior is filled with attempts to circumvent the normal processes of cognition. This is quite evident in the first aspect or phase of religion, namely, its function. Religious individuals have sought many values in religious behavior. The more important of these values may be classified in three categories: First, power, the power to overcome temptation, defeat enemies, throw back the challenge of natural forces, or to avoid whatever is considered inimical to human welfare; second, status, that is, one's position, rights, privileges before God and society; third, knowledge, relevant information concerning health, wealth, victory, the destiny of the soul, and whatever else may be of vital concern. *Metanoesis*, let me say categorically, has been employed in most, if not all of these areas.

At the savage level of culture, medical information consisted wholly of common sense diagnosis and remedies of the same cognitive character. However, the felt intellectual needs in this area were readily filled by recourse to metanoetic sources of information. Among the Melanesians studied by W. H. R. Rivers, an elaborate methodology was employed to determine what magician was responsible for a given ailment; what the prognosis for the patient might be; and what magical treatment was to be used.

Rivers describes a form of *metanoesis*—in this case, divination—used in Murray Island, in the Torres Straits between New Guinea and Australia. The natives believe in the potentialities of certain objects called *zogo*

\* WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT, professor of Philosophy of Religion and Christian Theology in The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado, and acting president since 1946.

which, when used in connection with given rites, produce disease. The metanoetic process whereby the sorcerer responsible is determined is relatively simple. At a shrine called *tomog zogo*, a number of stones and shells are so arranged as to form a diagram of the village. The shrine is visited at day break by a magician. If a lizard is seen leaving one of the shells, the house or village represented by the shell is believed to be that in which the person responsible for the illness lives. "If two lizards come from different shells and fight, the shell from which the victorious lizard emerged would represent the abode of the sorcerer. This shrine was also consulted for the purpose of prognosis, a dead lizard being a sign of the death of the patient."<sup>1</sup> This is but one of the methods used to aid in diagnosis and prognosis among savages. It is illustrative of the use of metanoesis in religion at certain cultural levels of society.

The situation does not differ greatly at another cultural level. The Romans of the Augustan Age faced a health situation which was, to them, almost as precarious as that faced by savages. Medical science, if we may use that term, was in its infancy. A Greek physician named Archagathus established himself in Rome about the year 218 B.C. He was too free with knife and cautery, however, and gave the Romans a poor impression of Greek medicine. The history of Roman medicine, using this term to mean the more systematic and intelligent practice of the healing arts, began about the year 90 B.C., when Asclepiades, a Bithynian physician, established a successful practice in Rome.

The efficiency of medicine in Rome during the Augustan age, approximately 27 B.C. to A.D. 70, may be determined by noting its significance for a given disease, namely, malaria. References to this disease in the Hippocratic Collection (ca. 400 B.C.) and in the writings of Claudius Galen (2nd century A.D.) indicate that it was of sufficient importance to engage the attention of serious students of medicine. Despite the fact that both the Hippocratic Collection and the

writings of Galen contain accurate descriptions of it in its several forms, neither body of writings offers evidence that either the cause of the disease or methods of treating it were known at the time. It was believed that stagnant water may have had something to do with it, or that foul air may have been a causative agent. When large numbers of persons were smitten by it, the air and all that floated in it were suspect. But no ancient authority ever connected mosquitoes, and especially the genus called *Anopholes*, with malarial infection. They approximated this conclusion, however, when they stated that such infection occurred in damp areas, and drew the logical inference that the plants, insects and animals which inhabited these areas were dangerous. Some of their practices, too, were effective. Wood was burned to keep the pestilence away. The smoke undoubtedly drove away the dangerous mosquitoes and thus probably saved some folk from the disease.<sup>2</sup>

It was not until the latter half of the nineteenth century that the nature of malarial infection was determined, and the specific mosquito responsible for carrying the germ identified. It is not surprising, therefore, that the physicians of the first century were baffled by this debilitating disease. They studied it and left quite accurate descriptions of it for later generations; they made ingenious guesses concerning the areas where the dangers of infection were highest, but they did not understand it nor could they combat it effectively. Even Pliny the Elder (A.D. 23-79), one of the most learned men of his time, admitted that medicine was helpless so far as quartan malaria was concerned.

Since medical practice proved to be so inefficient, the ancient Romans turned to magic and religion in their search for health. Gods and demons were generally credited in the ancient world with responsibility for both health and disease. The Romans, Greeks, Jews, Egyptians and Christians sought in religion for help denied them in medicine. The Romans themselves had at least seventy-three gods who functioned at one time or other

throughout their history in matters of health and disease.<sup>3</sup> In matters of diagnosis, the Romans used almost every art known to the priest and holy man. Incubation, or sleeping in the temple where the healing God by means of dreams, would communicate information concerning methods of cure, was a favorite of many ancient religions. Fasting and prayer were also used for metanoetic purposes.<sup>4</sup> Oracles of various kinds were consulted for information in times of epidemic and the advice received was accepted as both authoritative and supernatural. Asklepios, the Greek god of healing, was brought to Rome in 293 or 292 B.C. to stem a severe pestilence. This was done on the advice of the interpreters of the Sibylline oracles.

Divination, augury and astrology were used in the attempt to get information in many matters of vital and serious concern. Battles were fought or were avoided according as the divine prognosis was favorable or unfavorable. Metanoesis determined the behavior of peoples then as thoroughly as scientific method now presumably controls ours. With inadequate epistemological methodologies to guide them in their search for answers to primary questions, savage and ancient peoples had recourse to metanoetic practices of many types.

## II

Disregarding for the present the emotional stability which metanoesis may have given to those who practiced it, we may well ask ourselves whether or not such methods provided men with reliable knowledge in the field of medicine. The following changes in life-expectancy suggest the answer. By life-expectancy is meant the length of time a given individual may be expected to live. In Rome, during the Augustan age and in the west until comparatively recent times, the life-expectancy of individuals was little more than twenty-five years. Many people lived longer than that, but the average life time of persons in the culture was twenty-five years.<sup>5</sup> In 1825, the life-expectancy of western man was about thirty-five years; in 1925 it had risen to fifty-

five,<sup>6</sup> and at present it is sixty or better. Thus the life-expectancy of western man has more than doubled during the Christian era, and most of this increase has occurred during the past one hundred years. What were the factors which produced this change in life-expectancy? According to Sir William Osler, Canadian-born authority in this area, three such factors may be identified. The first consisted in the increase in "creature comforts," that is, in the raising of the standards of living. The second consisted in developments in sanitation and hygiene. This factor reduced infant mortality rates by as much as ninety percent in given areas. The third factor responsible for increased life-expectancy was the profound increase in the range and efficiency of surgery. These three factors can be correlated definitely with the decrease in mortality and the increase in life-expectancy.

Furthermore, as these developments occurred, interest in religious metanoesis in medical matters declined. Men lost interest in the healing gods and temple incubation and turned toward laboratories and hospitals. There appears to be no necessary correlation between possible religious developments and the control of malaria, to use a typical example. Growth in knowledge and skill are the determinable responsible factors.

## III

The case against the employment of metanoesis in religion is rather conclusive so far as medical knowledge is concerned. The same is true in such areas as predicting the outcome of battles, marriages, and other ventures. It is also true that the attempt to find extra-natural help in matters relating to food-production and food-conservation has been proved to be futile. There is an area, however, where some thinkers are tempted to rely upon metanoesis. The case against its employment here is not so obvious, yet the application of rigorous logic will show its futility here also. We refer specifically to the second phase of religion, namely, the interpretive or reinterpreted aspect.

Religious behavior, we stated above, always includes some reference to realities or a Reality which constitutes the objective or divine pole of religious behavior. In other words, religious behavior is behavior oriented toward that in one's total environment which is believed to be divine. When one attempts to trace the belief in the existence of an objective referent in religion, he finds a wide variety of conceptions among the peoples of the world. The natives of the Trobriand Islands attribute ailments of various kinds to a variety of non-human factors. The first is the *tokway*. It is a wood-sprite which lives in trees and rocks. It is said to steal food from the fields and yam-houses, and to inflict slight ailments upon people. The second is the *mulukwausi* or flying-witches, who are believed to be responsible for all rapid and violent diseases. These flying-witches are invisible but have the power to pounce upon people and to remove their "insides," that is, their lungs, heart, brains or tongue. These organs are hidden, and if they are not recovered in a short time, the victim dies. The third of these extranatural realities is an anthropomorphic spirit called the *Tauva'u* which is responsible for all epidemic diseases.<sup>7</sup>

These several names refer to realities which function in the thought and life of the Trobriand Islanders. They are the objective referents of their magico-religious behavior. If one questions them concerning the possible existence of these realities, the natives can point to the diseased persons as evidence of the presence of disease-sending gods or spirits. Furthermore, when pressed for more information, they have recourse to myths.

This word "myth" is another ambiguous term. According to B. Malinowski, whose studies of the Trobriand Islanders appear to be definitive, myth is much more than an entertaining story or a possible explanation of things unknown. It approximates what is sometimes meant by ideology, namely, the constellation of ideas which constitute the intellectual framework within which specific objects and events are understood.<sup>8</sup> Others consider that

myth "like secular folklore is an articulate vehicle of a people's wishful thinking."<sup>9</sup> It is unnecessary for our present purpose to evaluate these several theories of the nature of myth. It is sufficient to ask ourselves whether the specific contents of the mythology of the Trobriand Islanders concerning the supernatural or extranatural factors believed responsible for diseases have any basis in fact.

Unless one is prepared to discard the careful scientific work done in the field of medicine during the past two hundred years, he will have to reject the hypothesis that slight ailments are produced by the *tokway*, that flying-witches steal and hide the internal organs of persons and that the *tauva'u* are responsible for epidemic diseases. No matter how important myth may have been as a socially-cohesive factor, it was worthless as an explanation of the etiology of specific diseases. This distinction between socially-cohesive ideas and those which are adequately descriptive of objective conditions must be remembered if confusion is to be avoided in religious thinking. If one assumes that the word God refers to a reality which is, in part at least, as objective as "gravity," "space-time," or any other objective referent, then the fact that an idea is "socially-cohesive" may be important, but it is not especially relevant when the question of objective truth is raised.

When one turns to the healing gods of ancient civilization, and questions the existence of the goddess, Diana, whose specialty was diseases of women and the successful delivery of infants, the same situation obtains. It is obvious that contemporary medical knowledge recognizes no god or goddess as responsible for the ailments which befall the gentler sex, nor for that matter, for the successful delivery of infants. Yet Diana was believed to be existent and was acceptable to the Romans of the Augustan age. She was part of their "tradition" and her existence apparently was not subject to question. She was part of the "sacred tradition" and accordingly needed no justification beyond that. Despite



her "support" in tradition, no intelligent person today would undertake to support her possible existence. We have learned that the traditions of *other religions may be and often are very much mistaken*. We should assert that people who retain such ideas are, to say the least, seriously misled. No matter how well the healing gods of ancient civilization may have been supported by myth and tradition, they have neither significance nor reality for contemporary western man.

#### IV

If we grant then, that metanoesis, myth and tradition proved to be unreliable guides to men in their attempt to resolve their intellectual difficulties in the past, what relevance shall we accord them today? It is simply fact that the "healing gods" of the past were inutile, with the possible exception in those areas where anxiety was a primary etiological factor, so far as the cure of disease was concerned.<sup>10</sup> Malaria went its doleful way despite the best efforts of magician and priest. It has ceased to be a serious factor in human morbidity only after medical men discovered the germ responsible for it and the mosquito which served as carrier of this germ. The old metanoesis, myth and tradition failed to do the cognitive tasks they undertook. They have been proved to be invalid. Why then do they linger on among those who live in the twentieth century, and who presumably are aware that they do?

There are probably many reasons for this odd phenomenon. Let me comment briefly upon two of them. The first is the failure to distinguish the difference in the cognitive quality of ideas which are pragmatically useful and those which are true to the "facts." Any idea or group of ideas may be emotionally and even intellectually satisfying to persons who have never raised the question of truth, validity, or verifiability. As a youth, I believed certain ideas about God which were at once satisfying and functional in my thought and behavior. When I became a man, however, I discovered that "satisfying"

and "functionally efficient" were not relevant criteria of the truth of some ideas. I learned that there is a realm of "brute fact," and that eventually some of these satisfying and functionally efficient ideas had to stand judgment before the bar of this factual realm. Any serious study of the tendency in modern cults or neoteric religions will suggest the advisability of keeping one's theories tied as tightly as possible to the factual realm. Furthermore, the case-histories of modern psychiatry drive home this lesson with impelling force.

Religion, oriented as it is toward the more serious concerns of living, is peculiarly susceptible to the temptation to adopt ideas and ideologies which are adaptable to the needs of the persons and groups involved while at the same time overlooking the actual truth-value of the ideas adopted. The religious leader faces the task constantly of pruning, as it were, the extravagant claims made by the more emotional members of the groups with whom he works. If he, as intellectual as well as organizational leader, fails to distinguish the truth-value of an idea from its functional efficiency, then myth, tradition and even metanoesis are apt to find their way into his own thinking, to the detriment of the cause he seeks to serve.

The second reason for the continuance of outmoded attempts to circumvent the normal cognitive procedure may be the failure to recognize that one of the essential phases of religion is interpretation or reinterpretation.<sup>11</sup> There is much evidence which indicates that the term God refers to that larger environment upon which men depend for their religious values. Furthermore, one's understanding of the nature of the less immediate phases of this larger environment is controlled primarily by his knowledge and appreciation of the more immediate phases. If this is the case, and I am inclined to believe so, then the need for an extensive and valid understanding of the human and cosmic situation becomes evident. And such knowledge must be achieved, so far as our present epistemological information is

concerned, by means of the best, that is, the most reasonable and accurate, methods of study and research which are at our disposal. These methods are themselves inadequate and in need of constant refinement and improvement. But they represent the best methodologies at our disposal and should be used.

The conclusion is obvious, and, I believe, inescapable. Valid knowledge in any and every realm must be obtained by the slow and tedious methods of repeated observation and sustained reflection. Metanoesis, in all of its forms, is little more than guesswork.

#### REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> *Medicine, Magic, and Religion*, New York, 1924, p. 30.
- <sup>2</sup> Cf. Kind, "Malaria," *Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, (New ed., 1928), XIV, 838 f.
- <sup>3</sup> Jayne, W. A., *The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilizations*, (1925).
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 477 f.
- <sup>5</sup> Carr, Ralph I., "Achievements in Cancer Control," *The Journal of the Michigan State Medical Society*, (Jan. 1936), p. 19.
- <sup>6</sup> Garrison, Fielding H., *An Introduction to the History of Medicine*, (4th ed., 1928), p. 802.
- <sup>7</sup> Cf. Malinowski, B., *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, (1922), pp. 76 ff.
- <sup>8</sup> K. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, (Eng. trans. (1936), chapter II, may be consulted for a more extensive discussion of ideology. Malinowski's little book on *Myth in Primitive Psychology* is an excellent summary of his theory of the nature and function of myth.
- <sup>9</sup> Benedict, Ruth, "Myth," *ESS.*, (1933), XI, 181a.
- <sup>10</sup> Alexander, F., *The Medical Value of Psychoanalysis*, (Rev. ed., 1936), asserts that every disease has a psychogenic as well as a physiogenic basis. This does not mean that the ancient healing gods have any contemporary relevance, but that positive belief in some type of cosmic support may be important.
- <sup>11</sup> The term "reinterpretation" is preferable to "interpretation" for the reason that the religious interpretation of man and his existential medium always presupposes a primary interpretation of these realities whose inadequacies the religious interpretation seeks to correct. However, space does not permit development of this hypothesis here. It is developed more fully in "The Meaning of God in Religious Thinking," *The Iliff Review*, Vol. III, No. 1, and in two articles in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 and No. 4.

# Liberalism and the Challenge of Neo-orthodoxy

ROBERT M. MONTGOMERY\*

THE shifting meanings of the terms neo-orthodoxy and liberalism in current theological discussions make it profitable to define the two words at the outset. Neo-orthodoxy, descriptively defined, defends the Reformation theses of the sovereignty of God, justification by faith, and the Bible as the Word of God. Somewhat unlike orthodoxy, neo-orthodoxy treats selectively the principles of the Reformation. Altogether unlike orthodoxy, neo-orthodoxy is aware of the results of the historical approach to the Bible.

By reason of its emphasis upon the Sovereignty of God, neo-orthodoxy is known as neo-supernaturalism. Because of its acceptance of justification by faith and considerations such as the doctrine of original sin which support this classical Protestant view, neo-orthodoxy is described as realistic if not pessimistic in its anthropology. Moreover, it is accused, on the whole unjustly, of failure to support the concern for social progress. Since neo-orthodoxy regards the Bible as the Word of God, it is forced characteristically to relate its intellectual principles to the Bible in some way.

In the variety of writings which can be labelled as neo-orthodox, serious diversity of outlook often appears. For in one wing may be found a rejection of natural theology and apologetics, with an insistence upon the complete impossibility of man's finding in the data about himself anything relevant to God's Word. Barth, of course, is the outstanding representative of this outlook. In the other wing are those who insist that in man's own observations appear correspond-

ences to the comprehensions of revelation; thus the cogency of revelation is sometimes asserted in terms which are informed by a non-revelational viewpoint. Perhaps Brunner could be characterized as belonging here. Nevertheless, certain unities of statement run throughout neo-orthodoxy. Despite the varying selectivity from the Protestant tradition, beyond a certain framework the movement cannot go and remain Calvinistic.

The limits of liberalism, again descriptively defined, are far more broad. Etymologically, it includes the conclusions of the "free" man. Beyond that, its unities can be characterized only in terms of an attitude, a method, and, perhaps most important of all, a criterion of truth. Its attitude appears in the willingness of liberals without prejudices, if possible, to seek the truth wherever it may be found. Its method is largely that of empiricism with the employment of those hypotheses which make intelligible the discoveries of empirical studies. Its criterion of truth is that of rationality either in a narrow or a large sense of the word.

With these descriptions of our two terms, we may now proceed to the challenges laid down for us by neo-orthodoxy. I propose to point out five areas where neo-orthodoxy has criticised liberalism and to show that there is much which we may use constructively from the mass of arguments against the liberal position in theology.

In the first three areas where liberalism is challenged, I believe that we find genuine achievements of neo-orthodoxy. The first challenge comes from the fact that neo-orthodoxy has riddled liberalism's naive assumptions about itself. Many of us have taken for granted our objectivity while possessing presuppositions never subjected to description or analysis. The other day I heard from the lips of a liberal an adverse criticism of a speaker

\*ROBERT M. MONTGOMERY is Assistant Professor of Religion in Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa. He gained his interest in the movement of neo-orthodoxy by way of many discussions with neo-orthodox theologians and through seminars on outstanding theological works which are a feature of the extension program of Cornell College.

who had tried to relate the notion that man is a sinner to the problems of education. This liberal condemned the speaker for "bringing theology in," as though his own idea that man was essentially good were not equally a theological hypothesis. That liberals should have presuppositions is not at all astounding, for we know of no position or method of inquiry which does not demand them. Even the inductive method requires an "inductive leap." Furthermore, the very contexts in which liberals have been raised may determine what assumptions are pleasing or may give weight to a notion such as to make the rejection of it difficult.<sup>1</sup> The danger for us liberals lies in allowing these assumptions to remain unstated and unexplored, while we are pretending at the same time to occupy a position of unqualified objectivity. Our very employment of scientific methodology should force the recognition of the partial character of all our truths. Neo-orthodoxy by outlining our assumed truths forces liberalism to be truer to its genius.

Secondly, in its free use of mythology, neo-orthodoxy has pointed out another shortcoming of liberal theology. If by a mythology we mean the crystallization of basic assumptions in which is stated that which is more than, or less than, the rationally expressible, then we must admit that liberalism has been overcautious. There are areas of experience which affect man's life deeply which are not as yet informed by empirical studies. Such areas have been in the past illumined by the great creeds, although sometimes with contentions astounding to the reason. Yet liberals seem to find it hard to escape literalism without rejecting notions for which they have offered poor substitutes. For example, the extreme wing of liberalism has rejected the Genesis mythology in favor of empirical causality. But empirical causality means nothing more than necessary or sufficient temporal antecedence, a concept which has no power to illuminate the apparent causalities in which man finds himself. How much more cogently Genesis finds a home for man's appre-

hensions of purpose and meaning, the sense of being shaped by forces more powerful than he!

Or again in sheer reaction from the anthropomorphisms of our past we may reject the mythological statement that God is a Person, forgetting the power of that conception to capture man's judgment that qualitative distinctions must be made between man and the brutes, and mutualities, possibly of ultimate significance, bind man to man. Can a more honest acknowledgment be made of each person's intuition of his own uniqueness than in the provocative declaration that God is a Person? Can our experiences in prayer and worship be grounded better by any other idea, so long as our knowledge of prayer and worship remains provisional?

As I see it, liberal theology not only must be more daring in its adoption of mythology, but it must also recast some of the items it already possesses in its body of myths. The idea of automatic progress, surely an intuition which is best described as mythology, once supplied liberals with a dynamic for social reconstruction. Yet even before the first World War the hopeful notion of a dialectic in history which guided man's well-meaning efforts and compensated for his destructive acts had begun to lose its influence. Some new myth is needed through which a whole-hearted commitment to constructive ends can be secured even in the midst of chaos. The quest for a daring mythology which will throw light upon expanses of life which are at present, and possibly forever, beyond empirical analysis constitutes one of the most important tasks to which neo-orthodoxy has challenged us.

When liberal theology searches for an adequate mythology it must turn to the Bible among other sources. Here, a third challenge is thrown down to liberal theology by neo-orthodoxy—the challenge to re-examine the Bible to see if, preoccupied by historical studies, it may have failed to see provocative insights. As perhaps a typical student trained in the liberal disciplines of philology and his-



torical criticism, I emerged from doctoral studies with the conviction that the Bible belonged essentially to past centuries, and that while it contained some notions worthy of any modern mind, in intellect it was essentially immature. Contrariwise, if I desired maturity in thought, I could turn either to the Greek tradition or to modern philosophy.

The neo-orthodox, refusing to accept those contentions, have steeped themselves in the Bible.<sup>2</sup> In three ways of varying importance they have put forward the Bible as a great resource even for the intellect. In the first approach some, notably Bultmann, have explored the roots of biblical ideas in other cultures. Together with this scholarly account of the history of biblical concepts may be found a theological analysis. But liberal scholars have accepted oftentimes the scholarly results of this approach without committing themselves to the theological analysis; so this type of neo-orthodox commentary on the Bible has had little theological impact. The second and third approaches are more influential. In the second attack on biblical exegesis, some neo-orthodox scholars have searched the records of civilizations contemporary with those generations producing the Bible and have emerged with a judgment that there are unique ideas in the Bible. Over against other cultures, it is claimed, the Bible has relatively only one point of view and that viewpoint can be called "biblical theology." A third school of neo-orthodox writers has deduced the intellectual implications of the non-systematic approach of the biblical authors and has constructed with the aid of Augustine and Calvin a systematic theology of revelation. The "biblical theology" espoused by the second and third schools has roused much criticism among liberals for varied reasons. The fact that we are not content with the theology, and question the legitimacy of the exegesis involved should not blind us, however, to the significance of some of the questions raised in the new "biblical theology." For myself, I would confess that while I have not liked many of

the neo-orthodox answers, I have had new vistas in the study of the Bible opened up by neo-orthodox questions.

As I have maintained, in neo-orthodoxy's criticism of liberalism's unstated assumptions, in neo-orthodoxy's bold adoption of mythology, in its partisan support of the resources of the Bible, we are faced by genuine achievements. In the last two areas I have selected for discussion, however, neo-orthodoxy has understated liberalism. Of course, any polemic is wont to understate the opposition, for we are always tempted to set up straw-men to be bowled over by the weightiness of our own judicious attack. Still it must be admitted that in both these areas liberals have given partial credence to the criticism of the neo-orthodox.

The fourth area of challenge thus arises from the fact that the neo-orthodox have attacked liberalism as though it possessed a stable body of beliefs with a history which throws definitive light upon, and perhaps even determines, the modern position. This type of assumption has always seemed unfair to liberals, for we know what a variety of conclusions appears within the movement. Look at the differences which appear between New England and mid-western popular liberal theologies! For in truth the liberal can occupy positions ranging from one extreme of logic without life to another extreme of syrup and psychology. Surely the conclusions of liberals are affected by the historical unfolding of intellectual notions; probably the liberal would profit greatly if he knew more about that history. Nevertheless, the liberal reserves the right to make up his own mind and to use any cogent idea whether it has been endorsed or not by the liberal tradition. A criticism of the movements to which the liberal stands in debt does not *per se* reach the modern positions.

Still liberals have given partial credence sometimes to this misstatement by forgetting the variety of positions within liberalism and acting as though there was a normative set of dogmas for liberals. We often bind ourselves to old shibboleths, although "new occasions"

constantly crowd in upon us. Even the fact that liberals have written stirring theology in the past may curse us if we are rigidly attached to positions which were germane to the past alone. After all, a position is liberal not by reason of *what* it maintains, but through the method by which the conclusions are reached, the fact that the opinions are offered for criticisms, and the degree to which the position is submitted to the court of rationality.

The fifth area of challenge, another one in which liberalism has had less than justice, has to do with the attack upon the liberal criterion of truth. In the polemic, the criterion of rationality has been presented as though it were identical with Hegelian notions of rationality. On the contrary, rationality for many liberals includes far more than rational abstractions or application of the laws of thought to life. Rationality as a criterion possesses a more pragmatic cast and includes the full ebb and flow of man's richly variegated existence. It objects to paradox where paradox seems needless obscurantism, but by no means rejects it when paradox asserts a characteristic of experience not susceptible of capture in abstract terms. There may be many liberals who are willing to constrict the full measure of human life into a rationalism interpreted narrowly, but that that interpretation of rationality should be normative for liberalism is open to serious question.

Nevertheless this misinterpretation is useful if it challenges us as liberals to remember that the very word "rationality" presents us with a constant temptation to equate with the whole of experience the veneer of life which can be presented abstractly. We look at such fields as the sciences, mathematics, and symbolic logic where rationality in a narrower definition has triumphed and find it hard to resist using the criterion in the same way in the larger field of life. But the congeries of elements such as freedom, purpose, responsi-

bility refuse to be comprehended in so narrow a criterion. Why should there not be enough humility and methodological honesty in the liberal position to compel it to recognize that in an application to the full flow of experience the use of the criterion of rationality is a "venture of faith"?

It appears only right that liberalism should acknowledge its debt to this new Protestant scholasticism for the vigor of its criticism. Still there has been an apparent lack of popular response to neo-orthodoxy due to the fact that the position is unintelligible to one untrained in dialectical subtleties. Over against the strangeness of the language and method of neo-orthodoxy, liberalism on its part seems to possess a certain relevance to the assumptions of the modern world. But liberalism can dissipate the advantage of the objective spirit and scientific methodology if it chooses to ignore areas of life which cannot be comprehended in systematic fashion. If liberalism cannot help man to orient himself in some new fashion in our world, the ability to speak the language of the day will mean nothing.

Modern man searches for some insight which will penetrate into his situation and for constructive suggestion as to what the hour requires. I have great hope for a movement which stresses humility, a willingness to accept truths from whatever quarter they may come, and a method which ideally utilized forces the constant reexamination of basic assumptions. If our theologians can be truly liberal, I trust that from them may arise a prophet in Israel.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Not that Neo-orthodoxy invented the point that the context of a thinker is related organically to his thoughts. The "Sociology of Knowledge" has stressed this.

<sup>2</sup> This explains why one of my students wrote: "'For my ways are not your ways; neither are my thoughts your thoughts,' as Mr. Haroutunian says."

# The Terminology of Biblical Theology

ROLLAND EMERSON WOLFE\*

IT IS amazing how words that should signify most to us frequently become threadbare by careless usage, eventually losing much of their meaning. The term God is an example. By the unthinking way in which it is spoken, and by its over-use, this has become for many people one of the most meaningless words in our language. It degenerates into only a magic name with miraculous potentialities. People use it freely, but seldom stop to think what it signifies. That may have been at least partially why Jesus tended to avoid the term, using the expression, The Heavenly Father, which produced a more thoughtful mood among his hearers. Perhaps it was for the same reason that throughout the New Testament there were developed many variant designations of the deity. Today also, wise ministers and teachers are sparing in their use of the word God, preferring often to employ expressions such as The Creator, The Sustainer of the Universe, Eternal Light, or Eternal Spirit. These terms cause people to think and avoid the mentally passive attitude that so frequently meets one when using expressions that are unduly familiar.

The term God represents a basic concept in religion which cannot be eliminated, however much it may be carelessly employed and made meaningless by excessive repetition. One must guard against this by using such basic terms sparingly, thoughtfully, and wisely, so they will not grow commonplace.

By contrast with this basic vocabulary of religion, which includes God, prayer, etc., there is what is called theological terminology. This is largely a derived system which in a secondary way plays on the basic religious

ideas. The theologian divides the elemental concepts of religion into their several attributes. In so doing, however, there is a tendency to lose the picture of the totality with which he is dealing.

Treatment of the subject of God again furnishes a good example. The theologian is not as much interested in the unit idea as in isolating specific qualities such as God's omniscience, his omnipresence, etc. By reason of this analysis and abstraction, the theologian tends to lose that fresh and vital vision of God which is found in the New Testament. Perhaps this is one reason for the prejudice against the theological school and the favoring of the biblical seminary in certain areas of Christendom.

Where theology is biblical, it is based for the most part in the Old Testament on the Priestly Editor, the Deuteronomic Redactor, and the secondary nullifications of the prophets. In the New Testament it quotes mostly from the fourth gospel and the epistles. A relatively small percentage of most systems of biblical theology comes from the religious mountain peaks of the Bible, namely the prophets and Jesus as portrayed in the synoptic gospels. This fact should cause considerable concern.

It is worthy of further notice that most of the biblical theologian's terminology is non-biblical, a superimposed system of terms that are often foreign to the spirit of the Bible. What has gone by the name theology is primarily a medieval creation, and has as its besetting liability the shortcomings of medievalism.

By the middle of the last century, the usages of the biblical theologian tended to become a stereotyped terminology which was relatively meaningless, fossilizing thought rather than stimulating it. One of the important accomplishments of biblical scholarship during

\*ROLLAND E. WOLFE is Harkness Professor of Biblical Literature in Western Reserve University and president of the National Association of Biblical Instructors for 1947.

the past hundred years has been to emancipate the student of the Bible from the cramping effect of the old theological terms and method which previously had been in common use. In the era of modern biblical scholarship it has ceased to be a virtue merely to repeat the old theological shibboleths. No small part of the secret behind the development of the marvelously new perspectives of modern biblical study has been the fact that the old threadbare usages of medieval and early modern times have been abandoned in favor of more meaningful expressions.

With the resurgence of the theological approach today, one cannot help but fear that the freshness and vitality, which have been perhaps the chief assets of the critical and history-of-religions approach of the past fifty or seventy-five years, will be lost again in stifling theological terminologies.

The matter of perspective is important, also. The orientation of the critical biblical scholarship of the past hundred years has been toward the future. Perhaps the greatest liability in the contemporary renaissance of biblical theology is the orientation of so much of it not toward the future but toward the past, toward medievalism and the latter part of the New Testament, where the paganization of Christianity was already well under way. This biblical theological resurgence is therefore in danger of being a distinct disservice to the cause of progress.

As a matter of fact, the historical and critical age of modern scholarship has been theological in the best sense. It cannot be labelled non-theological simply because it does not use formal theological vocabulary. Many a modern scholar who shuns the theological usages is more dynamically religious than those previous writers who passed out what was supposed to be inherited knowledge in traditional phrases and words. The modern movement has given a theology that is built into life and does not need ornamental phrases.

One tragedy in the contemporary revival of biblical theology is that it is premature. Even the movement of modern scholarship has

not yet done enough clearing away of the sterile theological words and phrases which have retarded our understanding of the Bible. The most advanced biblical scholarship has not yet gone far enough in translating the terminology of the Bible into concepts that are compatible with modern thought. We have taken it for granted that when the words of the Bible have been translated from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into English, the great task has been done. This, however, is only half of it. The other half is that the manner of thinking in the Bible must be translated into the modes of thought prevailing today. Here particularly, modern scholarship has not yet gone far enough.

An example is the frequent statement that God said so and so to this or that person. Very few have gone so far as to rule out God's speaking to man. Here the writer of the fourth gospel was more progressive than most of our advanced biblical scholars. He said (1:18), in challenging the literal truthfulness of many of the stories at the beginning of the Old Testament, "No man hath seen God at any time." He also might well have added that "No man hath heard the voice of God at any time."

Our theology must be built on the realization that God spoke no differently to the people of ancient times than he speaks to us today. What seems to be a difference is merely a variation in terminology and description. The people in Old Testament times did not realize that man possesses a mind. When they got a new idea, whether good or bad, it was self-evident to them that God (or Satan in the later period) had spoken to them. Their belief was very definite. They said, "Thus saith the Lord" or "Yahweh said unto . . . ." They were truthful in their statements, in so far as they knew. However, when their truthfulness of concept is taken over into our age without alteration, it becomes falsehood.

Many young people have become discouraged in the religious quest because God does not speak to them. They are told how he spoke to the people in the Bible, and many



churchmen tell of how God speaks to them today. The young persons come to the conclusion they are evil, or God would speak to them also. This is an example of one of the ways in which our prevalent theological manner of speaking retards rather than aids the cause of religion.

Whatever theological development there may be in the future, it ought at least to be a true theology which will not mislead. A character in *Who's Who in America* said recently that ministers "tell more lies than any other class of people in existence." He was referring to theological misrepresentations and half truths. In our theologizings we frequently do not have that elemental truthfulness that is so nobly displayed in Psalm 19. The author tells how the heavens "declare the glory of God," how they "utter speech" from day to day, and "impart knowledge" from night to night. Then this psalm writer apparently paused a moment and thought what the adverse consequences might be if people should take his words literally. So he added the qualification "there is no speech nor language" and "no voice can be heard." In this manner he insured that these pictorial words would be taken by people figuratively rather than literally. This does not decrease the effect of the psalm. In fact it makes it more powerful, because of the absolute truthfulness on the part of the psalm writer.

One could hardly have expected the author of the Moses story, in that pre-psychological period, to have pointed out that the dialogue between God and Moses, which followed the experience of the burning bush, was in reality a dialogue between his higher and lower self. Yet, if we present this in any other way today, we are guilty of falsehood. In other words, any biblical theology, that is worthy of being perpetuated today, must be thoroughly conversant with modern psychology, and must at each point substitute present psychological terms for the biblical expressions in the explaining of a story. There is a distinct religious advantage in all this. By showing our students that God spoke no differently to the

patriarchs and other people of ancient times than he does to us, we remove the otherwise impassable barrier between the Bible and the student of today.

Most of what we have known of biblical theology, even the dominant contemporary form which is the product of various so-called "neo" movements, is based on a biblical literalism which cannot serve this present day effectively. It blows as a stifling wind from antiquity and the middle ages. Someone has said that theology is the invention of the devil. It is apparent that there is much truth in this statement, when we consider the untruths which have been and are still perpetuated in the name of biblical theology.

Perhaps the most decisive theological term is the word revelation. The biblical theologian in our day is reviving this term. The modern movement of biblical scholarship has shown that there is no such thing as revelation of the kind to which the biblical theologian refers. The critical biblical scholar must admit, and is free to do so, that in the larger sense all the world and everything that exists is a revelation from God, always has been, and always will be. The issue between the biblical scholar and the biblical theologian comes in the matter of special revelation.

To the biblical theologian, whether of the medieval or one of the contemporary "neo" types, the Bible contains the record of a succession of specific interventions of God in the course of history, in each of which he was re-emphasizing what was already known, or was teaching something new. The modern movement in biblical studies has shown that this doctrine is an illusion. The increasing God-consciousness of man is due not to revelation but to discovery, man's increasing discovery of God. It is not God stooping down to man's level and talking man's speech, but man aspiring to God's level and trying increasingly to talk the language of divinity.

By eliminating this idea of special revelation, great benefits to faith result. The biblical theologian who goes on the special revelation theory is bound to attribute to God all things

ascribed to him in the Bible. Back in the Old Testament he was a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generations of them that hate him. He commanded the ruthless killing of men, women, and children. In the New Testament we have forgiveness seventy times seven, and turning the other cheek. How account for the difference? On the revelation theory God has been either a changing God or a deceitful God. If he is a changing God, we cannot rely upon him. But I prefer not to believe that God is changing, but that he is the same yesterday, today, and forever. If we hold to the revelation theory, it is necessary to conclude that God was untruthful in one of these instances. In which instance then was he guilty of falsehood, when he, as it is claimed, revealed himself as an unmerciful avenger, or when he revealed himself as a God of love? It is frequently said that he revealed himself only partially in the Old Testament. Even if this contention be granted, is not an intentional partial revelation a lying representation? A half truth is only a shade better than a falsehood, and often more harmful. I do not like to hold God responsible for the partialness of the knowledge of him that frequently is expressed in the pages of our Bibles.

When we cease to think in terms of a special revelation of God to individuals, certain barriers to faith are eliminated. God is then no longer to be held responsible for the partial view of him found even in most parts of the Bible. The fault is only man's inability to comprehend anything higher. There are great religious advantages in looking at the Bible as one increasing process of the discovery of God on the part of man. The emerging biblical theology of today in most instances reverts to the old doctrine of revelation. In this respect, it does a distinct disservice to the cause of religious understanding and the progress of biblical studies.

Special consideration may be given to another term that is a favorite among biblical theologians. The Bible is spoken of as the

word of God. In churches one notes the satisfaction with which many a minister refers to it as "the word of God." Such people have never read their Bibles discerningly. The Bible is not the word of God. It is the word of man, the word of man about God. That is why it is so faltering in its early parts, and why we have so many different views of God in the Bible. The early concepts of deity are the result of man's creating God in his own image, fashioning the divine after human likeness. To speak of "the word within the word," as some theologians do, is merely a council of despair that tries to save the basic concept by setting up a more abstruse and unintelligible terminology. In addition to banishing the word revelation from our modern theology, it is also necessary to discontinue calling the Bible the word of God, for it is not the word of God. It is the word of man about God.

In these paragraphs reference has been made to only a few of the common theological usages. These, however, are a sampling of the whole. The objections to these terms apply more or less to many of the theological designations in common use. In fact, they apply even to the term theology itself. I should be glad also to see this word fall into disuse. The term is a barrier to the layman, who looks upon theology as a study for the theologian and the theological school. If we could avoid the rather forbidding word, theology, and speak more in terms of the development of religious ideas and concepts, Bible study might have a freshness that would make it more appealing.

The war period has undoubtedly been the prelude to a new era of biblical studies. The question is whether it will be a better era, or a worse. Although begun previously, it is claimed the acceleration of the movement for the revival of biblical theology is a result of the opportunity for reflection offered by the breathing spell of the war. This assumption may be subject to question. In times of exhaustion, the individual slips back into childhood feelings and attitudes, and tends to degenerate into using childhood phrases. Is this not what has happened to biblical studies

as a result of the strain and anxieties of war? With the great minds of Europe in this field dulled or silenced for half a decade, American biblical study has not had sufficient vigor to maintain its advance in the scholarly critical way. May the reversion to biblical theology, with its phraseologies of former generations, not be the reversion to more primitive types on the part of a generation which does not have the ability to pioneer in the first-rate critical pursuits of biblical scholarship?

If we are to have biblical theology, it is important that the goals be clearly defined and that we make certain the modern theological movement shall go in the right rather than the wrong direction—that it shall move toward the centuries ahead rather than be a stampede toward medievalism and ancient uncritical thought. A biblical theology that will really serve us must be oriented toward the twenty-first century rather than be pointed toward the past.

The biblical theology of the future must be a true theology if it is to advance the cause of biblical studies. We are reminded of Job, the higher critic of his day, in contrast with his three friends who were the biblical theologians of that time. Job chided his friends for speaking unrighteously in defense of God. That is what many a biblical theologian has been doing through past centuries and what some are doing today. One of the chief troubles with biblical theology is that it tends to use biblical terms without translating them into modern modes of thought. In this way, to the recipient theology becomes in effect the purveyor of falsehoods rather than the guardian and dispenser of religious truth.

A biblical theology that may do service to us would do well to avoid the old threadbare and often untrue terms of the past. To put new fullness of meaning into these words is a rather

hopeless task. Rather than try to put new wine into old wineskins, it seems better to relegate them to disuse. The need now is for the development of a new set of theological terms that will be worthy of the present perspective and more consonant with modern thought. This must be as far in advance of what we have hitherto known as the technological developments of the past five years are an advance over the previous history of man's scientific thought.

A worthy biblical theology must be built, far more than any yet devised, upon the century of critical scholarship which is about to be completed. This can not be a theology that is fighting biblical criticism, as so many of the theological biblicists are doing actively or passively today. It ought to be a theology that moves in harmony with biblical scholarship and sets about to gather the as yet largely ungathered fruitage of it.

Any theology that arises at the present time should be regarded as only a tentative theology, and can be phrased only in provisional terms. Critical biblical scholarship has not yet run its course. Furthermore, these times are too radical for anything to be fixed and final. The rising biblical theologies must be regarded as only provisional, and should be capable of easy change to conform with our rapidly altering perspectives.

We have been able to understand man's progressive religious development much better since we have been loosed from the bonds of theology. It is hoped that, by the terms which it develops and uses, the new biblical theology will be more worthy and effective than was the old. It may also be guessed that its effectiveness will be proportional to the degree to which it shuns the traditional and embraces the revolutionary concepts of thought which characterize our time.

# Higher Criticism and Biblical Problems

IRA JAY MARTIN\*

**I**N APPROACHING the problem of this symposium, it is necessary for one to face frankly the question which Dr. Amos Wilder raised in his editorial in the February, 1946, issue of this Journal. He said: "Biblical Theology since Gabler has indeed aimed at historical-critical procedure. The question is whether historical-critical procedure does not need to be re-thought" (p. 4).

## ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING THE TOOLS USED BY HIGHER CRITICISM

Our first task is to re-appraise the tools employed by higher criticism; i.e., those tools which must be used skillfully by the higher critic before he can make a sincere investigation of his various problems.

1. Dr. Brightman in his recent article "The Neo-Orthodox Trend" (in the August, 1946, issue of the Journal) calls upon us once again to *reaffirm our faith in reason and progress*. He is quite right in saying that recent religious thinking has beaten a path to the irrational in its approaches. Despite the tendency toward irrationality (partially a result, no doubt, of wartime psychic tensions) the only sure foundation for thought and action must rest upon our faith in (1) the integrity of man's mind and (2) the evidence of the on-going process of life.

2. We would also *reaffirm our belief in the validity of the tools of the arts and the sciences and their findings*. Such fields as anthropology, archaeology, biology, geography, geology, history, literature, music, political science, psychology, and sociology have contributed the proper tools not only for their own studies but for the studies connected with Holy Scriptures. Perhaps it is too dogmatic to say that unless we are willing to accept the method and contributions of each of these

arts and sciences, we shall never be certain that we have undertaken the proper approach to our field of investigation nor can we rest assured that the findings which result have even a glimmer of truth in them. The place of revelation and of intuitive knowledge must be ever checked by the tools of these arts and sciences, and by further investigation. This means that we must allow each one of these areas of study to contribute the tools of higher criticism before we can in turn use higher criticism as a tool for the discovery, understanding, and interpretation of what is now called biblical theology.

3. This raises the important question of our *concept of inspiration*. For many, even in this enlightened age, inspiration of the Holy Scriptures still remains a matter of divine dictation to an earthly stenographer, rather than the inspiration which leads and drives the scientist and the historian, the sociologist and the literateur to express, according to God's laws, his will and his methods of action and purpose. Mrs. Lyman in the February, 1946, *JBR* (p. 8) has already expressed this very affirmation of faith in our procedures of investigation. She has seen them as we are seeking to express them here in terms of the inspiration of God; for after all, this *is* God's method of revealing not only his laws but his will.

## THOSE ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HIGHER CRITICISM CAN DO

That which we have sought merely to reaffirm, perhaps, should be more fully studied and thought out in some future article or address. However, we must move on to the second group of assumptions. When the above criteria are accepted as valid for the functioning of higher criticism, then we must seek to distinguish the results when higher criticism is used as a tool

1. *The Historical-Sociological Results*. Be-

\*IRA JAY MARTIN is Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Berea College.



fore we can truly understand and appreciate the theology of the people of a given period or age, out of which a given book of the Bible comes, we must have a better perspective of the *milieu* in and out of which their literature and theology are conceived. We must know as fully as historical and sociological research can restore it, the *Sitz in Leben* of the people of that time. This means that we must rely in faith upon the tools of the historian and the sociologist, but the results will aid us in understanding the quirks of mind and thought which determine the given theology of a given period.

2. It is only when we accept and affirm, within limits of course, the findings of the *anthropologist and psychologist* that we are able to comprehend properly the personalities of those individuals who lived, who worshipped, and who expressed their thoughts in what we call Holy Writ.

3. We can never completely separate the *literature of the Bible* from the literature of mankind. It is only when we use the tools of literary criticism, by which we may determine the date, the author, and the ideological context of the particular work that we shall be able to express and interpret correctly the message or content of any given book of the Bible. Only when one knows the chronological relationships of the various books of the Old and New Testaments can one with some assurance clearly trace the theological thinking and the literary expression of its various authors and redactors.

4. When one can establish the *milieu*, the personality traits, the religious experience, and the literary expressions of a given person or groups of people, then one can better understand the *religious activities and conceptions of this individual or society*, for it will undoubtedly reflect some portions of the environment in which the author lives. This does not mean that God has nothing to do with the actions and thoughts of these religious persons. Rather it indicates that God is inspiring them by revealing to them and guiding them into the various aspects of his will. It is in this area that biblical theology comes to

life. In a sense, God reveals truth in the same manner yesterday, today, and forever. However, man's ability to understand and perceive eternal truth has varied from time to time not only in terms of response, but in terms of interpreting it to his fellowman from generation to generation, and locale to locale. This, as I understand it, is the unfolding characteristic of biblical theology, which some scholars either refuse to accept or do not have the eyes to see.

#### APPLYING THE RESULTING LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS PROCESSES TO THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

Having stated our assumptions as to what we believe the results of higher criticism can do in connection with our understanding of biblical theology, we would now seek to give several basic statements followed by examples from both the Old and New Testaments, which will aid us in the discovery and interpretation of biblical theology. It is impossible from our point of view to discuss thoroughly and truthfully the theological concepts of the Bible without first knowing the chronology of the various books thereof. For one must observe the development of the concepts by noting the stages of their unfolding from book to book. This is the part of the difficult task of the teacher as he seeks to help the student to discover this fact. Then having traced the development and relationships of the various aspects of the doctrinal concepts, we must seek to uncover the fundamental truth which each interpretive concept is attempting to express. Probably this is the only unity which we can ascribe to the Bible; i.e., the truth underlying man's search and interpretations in each generation.

Now to illustrate from the Old Testament. We cannot sincerely help the student to unearth the doctrines of biblical theology if we do not first of all trace the development of these concepts in some such manner as Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has done in his book, *A Guide to Understanding the Bible*. Having traced the concept of God, for example, from

the simple thoughts of an animistic people through the stages of the tribe, the nation, and the influence of the prophets, we must attempt to uncover the truth concerning God which each generation of interpreters has attempted to make known to us. This means that we must know the theological concepts of God as revealed in the "J" document, the "E" document, the Deuteronomic reform, and the Priestly compilation, in order to discover really the fundamental idea of God as the Jew came to know and understand it. Then our task must be to raise questions as to which of these interpretations is nearer the truth as we now seek to understand it in our generation. For we must not be led astray by the time element in our investigation. Just because the most recent interpretation is thus and so does not necessarily mean that it has a deeper insight than a more primitive interpretation. This we will illustrate in the New Testament part of this question.

To take another illustration from the Old Testament area, *the concept of evil* has had a checkered course. It would appear that in the pre-exilic period everything in the experience of man stemmed from God. Therefore the case of melancholia which Saul had is traced to God's instigation (I Sam. 16:14, 18:10, 19:9) rather than to some demonic source as would surely have been done in the first Christian century. Higher criticism tells us that the concept of Satan or the Devil evidently came into the thought process of the Jews during the period of the exile. This, of course, opens up the whole problem of Near Eastern thought upon Judaism. We must know this fact before we can properly interpret and understand biblical theology at this point of contact.

A third possible illustration may be in the realm of *immortality*. As a result of the findings of the higher criticism, the book of Job has been placed rather late and on the basis of the chronology of the Old Testament, we are led to understand that the early Hebrews were relatively unenlightened concerning the life of man after the death of the body.

In the early fourth century some great writer of deep spiritual insight wrote the book we know as Job in order to raise some very important questions concerning immortality. "If a man die, shall he live again?" (Job 14:14). This raises the hope which is never quite satisfied for the Jew, but for the Christian the resurrection of Jesus turns that hope into a certainty.

Let us continue with examples from the New Testament, beginning with *the doctrine of Christ*. Research in higher criticism leads to the conclusion that the Gospels were written in the following order: Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John, and that these Gospels were preceded by the epistles of Paul, and were followed by other epistles, perhaps by the "Ephesian" letter. Upon the basis of this chronology, we discover the following developments of the concept of Christ. It would appear that in the post-crucifixion and pre-Pauline period Jesus was regarded as the Christ only in the resurrected state. Then during the Pauline ministry, the question was raised in the early church whether Jesus had not been the Messiah before the crucifixion. It is generally accepted now that Mark is reflecting his own period when he presents the "Messianic Secret," and declares that Jesus became aware of his Messiahship at his baptism. A decade passes, and the church raises a further question. If Jesus is the Messiah in his resurrected state, and if Jesus had been the Messiah during his earthly ministry, may not he have been the Messiah during his entire life, whereupon both Matthew and Luke attempt to reflect their generation by offering the doctrine of virgin birth wherein they seek to establish that Jesus was born the Messiah. Another decade passes, and from the environs of Ephesus, at least, the thought comes, perhaps due to the influence of philosophical speculations and concepts, that the soul of Jesus may have been the Messiah from time immemorial, and that he came and inhabited an earthly body for the purpose of redeeming men only to return to his previous state of spirituality upon the crucifixion, or "ascension." There-

fore says John's Gospel: "In the beginning was the word . . . and the word became flesh and dwelt among us" (John 1:1, 14). One must raise the question which of these four attempts to interpret the secret of Jesus' sinlessness and the secret of the power to redeem is the true one. Here we see the attempt of various generations to struggle with the problem of understanding Jesus. Just because John happens to be the last interpreter in the above discussion does not make him the more truthful or the one having the deepest insight into the actual fact of the Messiahship of Jesus. Mark may be closer to the truth and truer in his interpretation than John. That is what we must attempt to decide as we help our students to find the fundamental biblical theology.

Let us take as a second example an early phenomenon in the Christian church: *the gift of tongue-speaking*. Higher criticism reveals to us that First Corinthians was written before the Acts. Therefore we should study the matter of tongue-speaking from the point of view of this historical sequence. Thus from First Corinthians we learn that tongue-speaking was rather incoherent gibberish, the vocal expression of man's inner response to the presence of God. Normal vocabulary proved insufficient to express the joy which was that individual's experience. Because the tongue-speakers in Corinth had become rather obnoxious in their attitude toward their gift, Paul is compelled for the sake of the cause to put such limitations upon it that it practically eliminates the phenomenon from the public services of the post-Pauline church. This may explain why Luke in writing his Acts either does not know what tongue-speaking is or, desiring to raise it above the obnoxious state to which it had fallen by his time, interprets it as the gift of foreign language-speaking bestowed upon the early church at Pentecost and only at that time. Luke elsewhere appears quite willing to let it be gibberish in his reports of tongue-speaking in Acts 4:31; 8:14-17; 10:44-48; 11:15-17; and 19:1-7. Luke wants to make Pentecost an

exceptional day. Yet he appears to be unwilling to allow tongue-speaking on that high and holy day to be the gibberish it then was and always had been. Whereupon he attempts this new interpretation. Thus we discover the truth of the matter regarding *glossolalia* in the apostolic Church when we take the results of higher criticism in placing First Corinthians before the Acts.

Let us take one final illustration. This is *the doctrine of salvation*. If Jesus preached so that men were saved on the basis of their faith, are Jesus' interpretations and emphases upon the kingdom of God and the moral life necessary for inheriting the kingdom of God correct? Repentance, both in terms of remorse and re-thinking, was the only criterion Jesus demanded for the salvation of human souls. Yet when we come to the early church following the death of Jesus, Luke appears to be quite truthful in stating that salvation, as the primitive church understood it, came as the result of one's acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah. In Acts 1:38 Peter is portrayed as pronouncing the theme of Christian Salvation as repentance, and belief on the Lord Jesus Christ instead of as repentance and belief in the coming kingdom. Evidently, and on the basis of the results of higher criticism, we see the shift (which came as the result of the crucifixion, the resurrection, and Pentecost) from the centralization of man's salvation in the kingdom of God to that in his loyalty to Jesus. Then decades passed and by the time the Johannine Gospel appeared, the emphasis had changed once again. This time it was man's desire for "eternal life." The Christian was no longer concerned with the kingdom of God as such, but was only concerned with his loyalty to Jesus in terms of securing eternal life by means of an experience which he called rebirth. Later on we discover that this is ultimately interpreted in terms of church membership; i.e., one is not saved until one has joined the church. Once again we must ask the question: which interpreter is nearer the truth of the matter? Are we saved by faith in the kingdom, or in Jesus, or in the church?

A period of general confusion appears to be ahead of us as biblical instructors in this matter of higher criticism and its relation to biblical theology. This resurgence of biblical theology has come probably as an aftermath of (1) war nerves, (2) ultra-liberal indifference to theology, and (3) the refusal of mediocre scholars to probe further in the field of higher criticism, and thereby their seeking to enter a new field with their limited knowledge. That may sound too critical of biblical instructors. Yet there is ample room for further scholarly research in higher criticism, as is evidenced by such problems as the genuineness of Colossians, the question of interpolations in the Pauline epistles (as suggested by Hawkins), *formgeschichte* in the Acts, etc. There is also an abundance of work to be done in this field of biblical theology. In fact, if we take this latter bus-

iness seriously, and "let the chips fall where they will," we shall come forth with some enlightening insights into biblical theology, and for example, probably a markedly different Paul from the one biblical scholars have taken for granted. The trend in many of our colleges has been away from higher criticism toward biblical theology in an endeavor to help the youth of this atomic age gain a faith that casteth out all fear. But to discuss merely the Pauline and Johannine theologies in our classes, without enlightening the students in the area of the higher criticism connected therewith, is doing our youth a great injustice. The future demands of our students may force us to urge or to require two courses for each Testament in fulfilling our obligations to them in the area of biblical problems and theology.



# The Problem of the Teacher

EUGENE S. ASHTON\*

THE new or rejuvenated interest in biblical theology seems to be only one phase of a far larger consideration in the field of religion today. That consideration involves the vitality of religious faith and conviction itself. We are seeking religious insight and spiritual maturity that can cope with our world wide dilemma. The teacher of Bible is invariably confronted with this larger problem because his efforts are seldom confined to the area of the Bible alone. In recent years we have all been aware of a renewed interest in religion and in what it has to offer in terms of an adequate solution to the world's ills. This interest has certainly been heightened by the war. On the other hand its roots seem to go more deeply into the thinking of this century than simply the war crisis. Man has found himself increasingly disillusioned by the materialistic values which so motivated his thinking and acting in the past decades. He has also lost some of the poise which he possessed when he preached the doctrine of man's inherent ability to solve his own problems and those of society. Science has revealed to him many wonders, but it has also revealed to him its own weakness. Science can place in man's hands great power but it cannot force, guide, or motivate him to a wise use of it. Statesmen have revealed to man the mechanics of a world-wide community but he has become increasingly aware that treaties are scraps of paper and charters are only as valuable as the good will and intent of those who sign them. Man is learning that he can not legislate one world. He and his fellow men must be motivated to build and accept a unified community.

\* EUGENE S. ASHTON is Associate Professor of Religion in Goucher College and lecturer in the Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary in Westminster, Maryland. He has accepted an invitation to become Associate Professor of Biblical Literature at Tufts College, beginning in September, 1947.

The inadequacy of man's scheme for life has gradually accelerated a turn to religion. That turn has been in the interest of a way of life and a motivating force for life that is valid and capable in relation to man's problems. He has sought through religious faith to find a sense of order in the midst of confusion, a valid basis of hope in the midst of despair, and a force for living that will enable him to rise out of the inadequacy of the present into a fruitful future. The success of this search has rested in a large measure upon the direction in which he has gone and the type of religious faith which he has found. To be sure, religious faith has in some cases provided a convenient escape from the problem itself. In other cases, it has presented so naive an answer for the individual that he has been driven to deeper despair. In still other cases it has provided a successful solution, as far as an individual himself solves the problem.

To teachers of Bible and religion this whole matter does, or should, have marked interest and importance. We know, perhaps, better than anyone else, the inadequacy of much of modern religious faith. We have the chance to study the temper of such faith, the character of its foundation, the reality of its superstructure. Some of us, at least, have grave misgivings when we contemplate the calibre of modern religious faith in its relation to the problems that face man and his world today. Some of us, I am sure, would criticize the Christian church today for its failure to meet the responsibility that belongs to it. The fact is evident that the church has not always reached out sufficiently with a cogent message that can help man find a vital religious faith. While other factors enter into the matter, a major portion of the responsibility rests with the lay and clerical leadership of the church.

There is no better example of this than a cross section of the incoming freshmen in a liberal arts college. There are exceptions, to

be sure, but one is impressed too often either by the total lack of appreciation of the elements of a vital faith or by the essentially childish and superficial character of the faith presented. Students who enter college today bear witness, in far too many cases, to a sound intellectual maturity commensurate with their age and a group of religious convictions suitable to a ten-year-old child. One does not expect to find a faith that is perfect unless we have lost our own humility in our search for truth. On the other hand we might expect a religious understanding equivalent to the maturity of the individual in other respects.

But to criticize the leadership of an institution like the church is, indeed, to criticize, in part at least, ourselves. Where shall the leadership of the church learn, where shall it find the data, where shall it have the opportunity to fit itself for its task if not primarily in the environment of college and seminary. Unfortunately all church leadership does not rest upon the foundation of college and seminary training. Equally unfortunate is the institution that sometimes passes for a college or a seminary. But just as unfortunate would be our use of such considerations as an excuse for the present situation. We cannot separate ourselves, nor do I think we want to, from responsibility that is ours in the whole problem of the vitality of modern religious faith.

It is at this point that the problem of the teacher arises: what is his responsibility to the student? It is the student who potentially represents leadership in the religious life of the community. Some criticism, partly voiced by the biblical theologian, has insisted that recent biblical scholarship has had little to offer by way of assistance to the religious life of modern society. If that criticism is just it has a direct bearing on the teacher. As a scholar and as one who deals in the fruits of scholarship the instructor in Bible and religion must be inseparably associated with the problem. It is pertinent, therefore, to ask once again wherein the teacher's responsibility rests. What is his task in relation to the student? What has been implied in the whole approach to biblical

scholarship with respect to the teacher's labors in the classroom?

Higher criticism as a method of study and research has implied certain responsibilities as well as certain limits to responsibility in the teaching of the Bible. But the philosophy which underlies the approach of higher criticism is not unique to the study of the Bible. It is equally applicable to the study of religion in general. The study of the Chinese classics has in more recent decades profited immeasurably from the use of principles similar in character to those which underlie higher criticism. Indeed, to go beyond the field of religion, is it too much to say that those ideals and principles which evoked and govern higher criticism are blood brothers of those which characterize the modern study of the liberal arts.

On the other hand it must be admitted that there is a wide divergence of opinion as to the goals of the teaching of religion and Bible today. Even a cursory glance at the articles appearing in the *Journal* of this Association would make that clear. As a body we might be convicted both of losing sight of the trees because of the forest and missing the forest because of the trees. Perhaps part of the dilemma has been either our unwillingness to accept the principles of a liberal education or our inadequate probing of the implications thereof.

It must also be noted that in many educational areas, whether on the level of preparatory school, college or seminary, the responsibility of the teacher has been and continues to be no real problem. Grant an authoritarian basis for faith, accept a final judgment in terms of religious truth and the problem disappears. The teacher's responsibility becomes one of delineating the intricate pattern of a self-contained truth. The only question that need arise is whether the best procedure is outright indoctrination or subtle persuasion. Certainly some would suggest that this is the solution, then, to the teacher's problem. Establish a pattern of religious faith, make it the basis in the teaching program and have all the courses of a given

curriculum serve as channels for the propagation of that system of dogmatics. If the fruits of a new study of biblical theology were to appear simply in a new form of dogmatism, here it will find kinship.

While this may be a solution that fits either the fundamentalist Protestant tradition or the Roman Catholic tradition, it can never come to terms with the liberal wing of Protestantism. That minority which has made a major contribution in religion of the twentieth century has been built upon a different foundation. And it is on this foundation that higher criticism has found the strength to build. In the first place, this minority has insisted that religious faith is a growing, maturing process as well as a body of fact and insight. Religious conviction is not something once attained and in the same moment fully understood. Religious insight, faith, or belief come through an unending search which in any given moment of time can exhibit only a measure of success and not complete fruition.

In the second place, this liberal wing has insisted that the individual must come to terms with his religious insight. He has the ability and responsibility to grow and mature in spiritual realities. He neither fulfills his potentialities nor accepts his responsibilities if he blindly accepts a static expression of religious faith. In the third place, this modern approach has insisted upon a rational basis for faith. No insight is adequate which does not meet the test of rationality. No religious conviction is justified which is not evaluated in terms of logic and reason. Under such circumstances, dogmatism old or new has no place in the liberal approach to religion. What is true of religion in general is equally true of the biblical field. The liberal point of view is lost when the Bible is presented in a dogmatic fashion. This is as true of the study of the theology of the Bible as it is of the study of the literature, the history, or the religion of the Bible.

Of course, one way of getting around all this is to pronounce liberalism dead. This is the age of purges, verbal and literary as well as

physical. Let us purge religion of this liberal spirit by pronouncing it dead. If it will agree to play dead, the situation can be resolved in the realm of dogmatics. There seems little chance, however, that a position so arduously won as the liberal point of view can be ruled out of the picture so easily.

The liberal Protestant tradition has from the educational viewpoint its close and intimate relationship with the study of the liberal arts. Many of us are engaged in the teaching of religion in a liberal arts college. In such cases we teach religion as an important part of a well rounded curriculum. The situation would be the same for any institution of learning that seeks to emulate the principles of education as understood in the valid liberal arts curriculum. It would not be to the point to attempt at this time a description of a liberal arts education. Nevertheless, a reminder or two is to the point. In the first place, it is well to keep in mind that such an education is based upon the rational point of view. Any subject in the curriculum is taught from the point of view that the rational approach is the valid approach. Teachers of literature do not propound non-rational theories. Teachers of philosophy or sociology may encounter non-rational flashes of insight but such insights have to stand the test of reason and logic. Indeed, much of a liberal arts education may resolve itself into a sifting of data and ideas and evaluating the same by means of the rational process. In the second place, a liberal arts education is a process by which the students individually and collectively are helped to achieve a measure of understanding in human living. By the analysis, evaluation and synthesis of ideas and elements alike, the student gains this measure of understanding. In the process, the teacher is always the guide, the helper, the counsellor. However, if and when he becomes the dictator, no matter how subtle, of the truth, the teachership has passed beyond the realm of the liberal arts education. The teacher can and should present the dogmas or beliefs of any field for consideration, but he

is not free to make those dogmas into dogmatism.

Let us return then to the problem of the teacher of religion. His responsibility, wherever it may rest, does not include the attempt to teach dogmatically a given religious faith. That has no place in the liberal Protestant tradition and no place in the curriculum of a liberal arts education. The teacher's job is not to provide the answer in one-two-three order. His task is to provide every conceivable source, tool and prerequisite that is available and valuable in the student's search for the answer. The religious faith or conviction, whatever it may be, must ultimately belong to the student completely and be that which he or she has achieved in the process of rational study. This does not assume the neutrality of the teacher. It is to be doubted whether an instructor is ever completely objective. The real question is whether he makes an honest effort in that direction or not. His goal and ideal at least must be an objective approach to study.

When the teacher approaches the Bible and the teaching of it, therefore, his responsibility is rather clear cut when envisioned in the same terms that gave rise to higher criticism. The Bible is a body of literature rich in man's experience of God. Its study can help to clarify the thinking and inspire the conviction of him who also seeks to know and understand God. Its study may contribute greatly to the development of a deep and sincere religious faith. Its study can also leave the student relatively untouched. That fact need not be either the teacher's fault or the fault of the source material. Teacher and material alike are at best aids to the individual's own grasp and understanding.

The teacher of the Bible has a threefold responsibility, although any brief summary leaves many loose ends. In the first place, it is the responsibility of the instructor to provide the student with the means of understanding this very important literature. With such an end in view he will seek to provide the historical background, the literary character of its

various elements, the general religious, sociological and psychological character of the various environments and periods in which the documents were written. The total picture is a large one. It may be that in the limits of a given course of study only a small phase can be covered. The instructor must see that the student has the technical equipment to push on alone. The intellectual discipline, the familiarity with the tools, and the rational method of procedure, are the fundamental fruits rather than any vast accumulation of facts and figures.

In the second place, it is the responsibility of the teacher to help the student to come face to face with the religious insight imbedded in this literature. It is not enough to know when, why, and how Amos prophesied. What he said is equally important though unless we know the when, why and how, his message will appear distorted. Or, again, it is not only important to know what David's biographer thought of his kingship, it is important to know the later idealization of that reign by subsequent authors. Jesus' life and teachings are of vital importance, but Paul's own interpretation of that life and teachings is equally important. I should like to go a step further in the process. I would suggest that the student does not fully appreciate the figure of David until he has had at least a glimpse of David's significance to countless generations of Jews and Christians as the ideal king of a righteous kingdom. By the same token, the student of the New Testament does not fully comprehend I Corinthians 11:23-25 until he has at least glimpsed its significance in terms of the sacrament as it has developed in the thought of the Christian Church. Simply stated, religious literature may have one significance in one age and a different one in a different age. To really understand the literature, the whole must be seen. The first chapter of Genesis in one age satisfied man's curiosity as to how the world began. In another day it provided the basis for religious teaching concerning the Sabbath. In still another day it became a dogmatic



basis for a theological concept of creation, and in yet another it has become a religious myth which seeks to explain the origin of a religious rite. All of this is involved in the teacher's responsibility to aid the student's understanding of these religious insights.

Finally it is the teacher's responsibility to aid in making some evaluation of the religious insight studied. Bible study like all education involves a search for truth. But truth is not truth because an individual says it is so. Isaiah was convinced that his message partook of the eternal character of truth. When we have evaluated what he had to say, by the various criteria of reason we can agree or disagree with him. If that which Isaiah prophesied was in part true, it is as vital for the student of the modern day as for the hearer of that ancient one. The teacher seeks to aid the student, therefore, in grasping a clearer knowledge of God and God's will and all that that implies, through the study of the Bible. Through the experiences and insights of others, student and instructor alike profit in their own search.

This, then, is the problem and responsibility of the teacher: to aid in the development of technique, to guide in the realm of knowledge, and to assist in the evaluation of the fruits of study.

Higher criticism has, I take it, been valuable in this process. It has provided the teacher with the evidence and continues to do so. When introduced to the student it has served and will continue to serve a similar purpose. But higher criticism as a phrase utilized in biblical scholarship has been a symbol as well. It has constantly witnessed to the rational approach in the study of the Bible. It has symbolized the integrity of biblical study, a study that need make no apologies to other fields of intellectual pursuit. It has repre-

sented the validity of a course in Bible study in the curriculum of a liberal arts college. It has stood for a sincere, honest endeavor in the pursuit of truth, an endeavor unbiased by the crisis of the moment, by the traditions of the church, or by the non-rational; but biased, if you will, by a devotion to and a love of objectivity.

I turn therefore, to the introduction of this paper. The interest in biblical theology is, I suspect, a part of the total interest in the search for a more real and vital faith for this day and generation. The teacher, I take it, welcomes this further expression of biblical study. The products of such study will certainly pass across the desk of the instructor and no doubt into the classroom. And at both the desk and classroom the theological result will come under that scrutiny or discipline which has been symbolized by the expression, higher criticism. The rational approach will apply as fully to this material as to any other phase of biblical study.

It is too soon to make a detailed value judgment of the contribution a new biblical theology can make in the field of education. From the books and articles published to date there would seem to be considerable divergence of opinion as to what the term implies and includes. No conflict will arise unless the biblical theologian tries to tell the teacher what he can teach and what he cannot teach. Then, of course, we pass into the realm of dogmatism. Conflict will come only when the biblical theologian seeks to go beyond reason, seeks to find some new basis for truth, some word behind the word. In short, the biblical theologian will encounter little opposition from the teacher unless the former tries to remold the latter or in dwelling too long on the shortcomings of previous study waxes dogmatic concerning his own results.

# An Exposition of an Old Testament Passage

ROBERT C. DENTAN\*

THE passage chosen for this exposition is a familiar psalm, the 130th. It is the psalm which has been used in the Christian church for countless generations as a part of the funeral liturgy, under the title "De profundis." It is used in this connection, not because it is "funereal" in character, but because of the magnificent way in which it gives expression to the whole reach of human emotions, from deep despair to unconquerable faith.

Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord,  
Lord, hear my voice;  
O let Thine ears be attentive  
To the voice of my supplications.

If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities,  
O Lord, who could stand?  
For with Thee there is forgiveness,  
That Thou mayest be feared.

I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait,  
And in His word do I hope.  
My soul waiteth for the Lord,  
More than watchmen for the morning;  
More than watchmen for the morning.

O Israel, hope in the Lord:  
For with the Lord there is mercy,  
And with Him is plenteous redemption.  
And He will redeem Israel  
From all his iniquities.

In the exposition of any passage of scripture, it is first of all necessary that we determine, as far as possible, the correct text of the passage to be studied. In the present instance,

\* This paper by ROBERT C. DENTAN, Associate Professor of Old Testament Literature at the Berkeley Divinity School, was originally read as part of a symposium conducted before the Chicago Society for Biblical Research on the subject, "What is Biblical Exposition?", and was part of a larger discussion on the nature of and need for biblical theology. Professor Dentan's paper, like that of Professor Bowman in the New Testament field, also printed in this issue of the JBR, was an attempt to indicate by concrete example what ought to be the standard procedure in the exposition of a biblical text.

the problem is not a serious one, since the Massoretic text as it stands yields a good sense and shows no obvious signs of corruption. However, there are two places in which the versions have interesting variants from the Hebrew and these deserve consideration, although only one of them is significant for the theology of the psalm, the other presenting us merely with a different figure of speech.

The first, and most important, of these variants is that in verse 4, where the Massoretic text reads "*ki immekha hasselichah lema'an tiuware*," "for with Thee there is forgiveness, that Thou mayest be feared." There is no intrinsic reason to suspect the text at this point, since the form *tiuware* is a perfectly regular niphal imperfect of the verb *yare* and yields, without strain or ambiguity, the meaning given in the various English versions. However, the LXX reads instead, "*heneken tou onomatos sou*," "for Thy name's sake," and some commentators have taken this to indicate the original form of the text. It is my own feeling that this is less intelligible in the context than the reading of the Massoretic text and I would suggest that the reading of the Greek is not due to the use of a different Hebrew text, but rather resulted from the error of a sleepy translator who unconsciously substituted the more familiar phrase "*lema'an shimka*" which, in some form, occurs repeatedly in the Psalms, for the unfamiliar and unparalleled "*lema'an tiuware*". The Vulgate reads "*propter legem tuam*," which is obviously based on a careless, but quite understandable, misreading of the Hebrew consonantal text as "*lema'an torah*." The one fact which has led some commentators to accept the reading of one of the versions in preference to the Hebrew is that nowhere else in the Old Testament is there any occurrence of a niphal form of the verb *yare*, except for variations of the participle, *nora*. How-

ever, this objection seems captious, inasmuch as the form is grammatically unexceptionable, and gives expression to a thought which, though unconventional, is thoroughly in accord with the spirit of Old Testament religion. This is not a conventional poem and one can hardly demand that the author express himself only in conventional ways.

The other point at which the versions differ notably from the Hebrew is in the figure given in the 6th verse. The Hebrew reads, "My soul waiteth for the Lord, More than watchmen for the morning, watchmen for the morning." Once again, the meaning of the Hebrew is clear and the image used is beautiful and appropriate. However, the LXX and Vulgate read, "From the morning watch until evening," while the Syriac reads, "From morning watch to morning watch." There seems to be no convincing reason to prefer either of these readings to that of the Massoretes. It is possible that the *repetition* of the phrase "watchmen for the morning" is due to scribal error. However, the preceding phrase contains a similar instance of repetition and both are probably due to the poet himself. Certainly they give a certain poignancy to the poem and contribute much to its peculiar charm. Duhm says that to remove these repetitions would be like clipping the wings of a bird and making it walk on two feet. Most of us would probably agree.

After one has determined the true text of such a passage as this, the next step is to try to date it and to discover the literary type to which it belongs. A relative date can easily be determined for the present passage inasmuch as the general atmosphere of the poem, its intense individualism, and personal, not to say almost mystical piety, quite obviously stamp it as a product of post-exilic, and probably late post-exilic Judaism. This judgment is confirmed by the vocabulary. The adjective "*qashshub*," "attentive," and the noun "*selichah*," "forgiveness," are found only in the latest strata of the Old Testament. As to literary classification, one notes in passing that the psalm is a "*shir hamma'alo*th,"

one of the "songs of ascents." This, however, tells us precisely nothing. The present psalm is obviously not a "pilgrim" psalm and has nothing in common with other "songs of ascents," beyond a certain atmosphere of simple and sincere piety. The Christian church classifies this as one of the seven "penitential" psalms, and Professor Gunkel, with all the elaborate terminology which he has devised for just this purpose, can find no better name for it. Yet it is certainly far removed from the usual mood of the penitential psalms. The poet frankly recognizes the fact of sin and its universality, but his attitude is not that of the penitent sinner, overwhelmed with the thought of God's wrathful *judgment*, but rather that of a man of deep and inward piety, whose heart is overwhelmed with the conviction of God's redeeming *grace*. To classify this poem in accordance with some preconceived scheme is to lose sight of its essential originality. Certainly, if we classify it by its dominant mood, we should have to call it a "song of trust" rather than a "hymn of penitence."

Having disposed of these essential preliminary questions, and omitting, for the sake of brevity, any consideration of poetic form and structure, our last, but primary, task is to discover the *thought* of the writer, his conception of man, of God, and of man's relationship to God, in other words, his "theology." In most cases it would be necessary first to give an exegesis of the passage verse by verse, and then proceed to a systematic view of the passage as whole. In the present instance, fortunately, these two stages may be combined, since the thought of the writer moves forward logically in a kind of Hegelian pattern. There is first the recognition of man's tragic lot and sinful state, then of God's antithetic, untouchable holiness, and finally of the reconciliation of this antithesis through a movement which begins from God to man, but concludes with man's joyful movement toward God. The final strophe, as we shall note, stands outside this pattern, but is a necessary supplement to it, since it stresses the *corporate*

character of the religious experience of the Old Testament.

In the first two verses, the prayer of the poet suggests the depth of his personal tragedy, without enlarging upon it. Unlike the writers of many similar psalms, the 22nd for example, the author does not attempt to arouse the divine pity for his fate by describing the symptoms of his illness or the cruelty of his enemies. Gunkel suggests that the occasion is probably a mortal sickness. One can say only that this is possible, but numberless other situations seem equally possible. It is, indeed, the very reserve of the author as to his own situation which gives the psalm its universal appeal. He does not, in so many words, assert that the lot of man is always and necessarily tragic, but his personal reticence sets his cry upon the universal plane and gives touching expression to the emotions of a whole nation which had learned through centuries of tragic experience that "man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward" and that all man's "pride is but labor and sorrow." The "depths" of which the poet speaks are the waters of Sheol, that dark, irrational, frightening world which lies just beneath man's feet and constantly threatens to destroy the brief happiness he sometimes attains. The poet feels himself caught in the flood of mysterious, demonic forces.

In the third verse, the writer turns from the thought of tragedy to that of sin, which he evidently regarded as its cause. Here, again, there is no account of his own situation, no list of his own transgressions, no beating upon his breast. His thought moves in the realm of the universal. "If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, *who* could stand?" The tragedy of man's lot is bound up indissolubly, if mysteriously, with the corruption of his will. There is no need to suppose that the psalmist regarded the myth of Genesis 3 as a literal account of the origin of sin and evil, but there can be no doubt that he subscribed to the philosophy which that passage expresses. The life of man is cursed because his will runs constantly counter to the will of God. "In

thy sight shall no man be justified." This was the lesson which had been burned into the soul of Israel by the angry preaching of the pre-exilic prophets, and the bitter experiences of the Exile and the frustrated dreams of the impoverished post-exilic Church. There is a deep and justified strain of pessimism with regard to man and his possibilities which runs through much of the post-exilic literature—which gives, for example, so somber a tone to the Priestly document. It is this tone which we catch in the opening verses of the psalm.

But the poet is pessimistic only as long as he looks at man and his capacities. His gaze turns upward from man to God, and the God whom he sees is not the angry God of the pre-exilic prophets, but the kindly and forgiving God of the Second Isaiah. When the poet thinks of *man*, he can think only of his tragic failure to conform to God's purpose and therefore only of the wrath which man deserves; but when he looks at *God*, he can see nothing but the forgiveness and reconciliation which God is always offering. To his mind, it is this which gives the sole adequate motive for religion. For so I would interpret the words, "There is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared." As is well known, there is no word in biblical Hebrew for "religion," and the *idea* is commonly expressed by the phrase "the fear of God." This is the thought which lies behind the psalmist's words. The true basis for religion ("the fear of God") is not to be found in God's *wrath*, but in his grace, in his willingness to forgive. It is this which determines the prevailing mood of the psalm, a mood so different from that of the usual "penitential" psalm. There is no grovelling fear or unhealthy self-abasement, no sense of tension or of crisis. The mood is that of a healthy and confident trust in a God whose goodness is greater than man's evil and whose grace has already bridged the gulf between man's sin and his own majestic holiness. It is for the manifestation of such a God that the psalmist waits, more eagerly than the watchmen on the city gate await the first intimations of the coming dawn.



The concluding verses are, however, no less significant and no less characteristic of the mature religion of Israel than the preceding verses. The poet is not content with a personal assurance of deliverance from evil. His last, and in some ways noblest, thought, is for Israel, the community of brothers to which he belongs. The older religion of Israel had been dominated by the thought of the solidarity of the group, and the individual had only slowly and painfully won his place in the scheme of things. In this psalm, the place of the individual has been securely established, but not in such a way as to destroy the values which inhered in the older view. For, even in this latest period, there is no place for a

purely private religion in the thought of the Old Testament. The religious experience of the individual always takes place within the group. Man's upward movement toward God is never the solitary flight of "the alone to the Alone," but is the common pilgrimage of the redeemed community. So the author of this psalm, at the height of an intensely personal experience, nevertheless turns his final thoughts toward the elect community of God and longs that they all might feel as intensely as he the certainty of God's power to overcome man's tragic lot and to redeem man from his tragic failure. "O Israel, hope in the Lord, for with the Lord there is mercy—and He will redeem Israel from all his iniquities."

# An Exposition of the Beatitudes

JOHN WICK BOWMAN\*

## I

God's Gift to you who know your spiritual  
poverty—  
the Kingdom of God is for you!  
God's Grace for you penitent—  
you shall find forgiveness!  
God's Blessing on you serene—  
you shall possess the land!  
God's Boon to you hungry and thirsty for  
Righteousness—  
you shall find satisfaction!

## II

Blessings on those who show Mercy—  
they shall receive Mercy!  
Privilege of those who are Sincere at heart—  
they shall be ushered into God's Presence!  
Honor to those who bring Peace—  
they shall be named 'God's sons'!  
God's Boon to those who are persecuted on  
account of their Righteousness—  
the Kingdom of God is for them!

Blessed are you when men hate you, and when  
they exclude you and revile you, and cast out  
your name as evil, on account of the Son of  
man! Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy,  
for behold, your reward is great in heaven; for  
so their fathers did to the prophets.<sup>1</sup>

## CRITICAL ANALYSIS

It will be recalled that the literary criticism  
of the Beatitudes has left them in the following  
condition:

*First.* Four are attributed to the "Q" source, Lk's  
version being considered rather generally the more  
original,<sup>2</sup> and these appear in the above (Mtthean)  
order as Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 9;

*Second.* Four are attributed to "special-Matthew"  
(*'M'*), viz. Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8 above;

\* JOHN WICK BOWMAN is Professor of New  
Testament Interpretation in San Francisco Theological  
Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

*Third.* Mtt's No. 3 is attributed to neither source  
and is thought to have been inserted, either by 'Mat-  
thew' himself when he combined his sources or by a  
later interpolater (Wellhausen);

*Fourth.* Mtt's No. 8 (*'M'*) is reckoned a doublet of  
Lk's No. 4 and as inserted by Mtt along with the latter  
in the order observed above.

The argument for discarding No. 3 (Mtt),  
first advanced by Wellhausen, rests upon two  
facts: (a) that it is for the most part a *quotation*  
from Ps 37:11 (LXX: 36:11), and (b) that  
in the presumably earliest form of the 'Western'  
text (D 33 a c d ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1,2</sup> h k l m aur. Syr<sup>cur</sup>  
Aph Eph) it precedes rather than follows No.  
2 as in the 'Alexandrian' text (Uncs. pler.  
Minusc. pler. b f q r<sup>2</sup> vg Syr<sup>sin. poesh.</sup> hl. hier.  
Sah Boh Aeth Ar, Geo Tert.<sup>3</sup> As for the first  
of these, all of the Beatitudes contain more or  
less direct *quotations* from the Psalms and  
Deutero-Isaiah, and if this argument were to  
be pressed it would militate against the au-  
thenticity of any of them. Again, while it  
is true that uncertainty of *order* at times con-  
stitutes strong probability of interpolation,  
it need not do so. An Old Latin scribe may  
well have transposed the two Beatitudes with  
a view to bringing together the 1st and 3rd,  
in which there are at once instructive similari-  
ties and differences—i.e. for the former, the  
nearly identical senses of the Hebrew *'āni*  
(poor) and *'ānāw* (meek), and for the latter  
the contrast between "heaven" and "earth"  
(land).<sup>4</sup> Add to these the symmetry of struc-  
ture observed to obtain between the two stan-  
zas as above arranged (four lines or verses  
each), and the apparent need of No. 3 to com-  
plete the development of the thought of  
stanza one (for which see below), and the con-  
clusion appears unavoidable that this Beati-  
tude came from the hand of 'Matthew', at  
any rate, and was not added by a scribe.

Form Criticism leaves the Beatitudes sub-  
stantially where they were when Literary

Criticism got through with them. Dibelius, for example, gives us two lists of four ('Q') and three ('M') respectively—viz. Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 9 for 'Q' and Nos. 5, 6, 7 for 'M',<sup>6</sup> treating these seven as a part of the words of Jesus. He argues that their "hortatory content,"<sup>6</sup> as well as their "prophetic tone" and "rhythmic form,"<sup>7</sup> point in the direction of originality.

### EXPOSITION

The purpose of this paper is to exhibit the progress of thought in the Beatitudes and to enquire as far as space will permit into their significance for a knowledge of the teaching of Jesus.

#### *Stanza I*

The differences in both *form* and *content* between the two stanzas are at once apparent. The more intimate second person of the first stanza accords well with the fact that in both Matthean and Lukan forms its aim appears to be to portray the spiritual progress of a "son of the kingdom" along lines laid down in the prophetic writings of the O.T. Scriptures. Its various elements represent a collection of scattered references from the Psalms and from Deutero-Isaiah, but as here arranged these exhibit genuine progress in the development of a type of personality. This we are left to believe is the portrait of the true follower of Jesus. And it is of the utmost importance to notice, what may easily escape the English reader, that the prophetic nature of the Beatitudes constitutes them so many Benedictions whereby the "blessings" they contain are conferred upon the type of character they severally portray, even as the corresponding "woes" in Luke (6:24-26) are intended as God's judgment of doom upon the opposite type. In each case they announce God's blessing, or conversely His condemnation, upon the stage attained in the development (or degeneration) of the personality, and the nature of blessing and condemnation is defined in the second member of the Beatitude and Woe.

I have attempted to call attention to the intended divine origin of these several blessings by introducing each Beatitude with the divine name and with an appropriate substitute for 'blessing'.

*Beatitude 1.* The 'poor' man (*ânî*) in Israel had from time immemorial been represented in the Law and the prophetic writings as an object of God's special care, and therefore was to be granted peculiar consideration by his more fortunate brethren, to be allowed the privilege of gleaning in the fields, to be given alms, and to be cared for in other ways implicit in the term 'brotherhood'.<sup>8</sup> A verse like Prov 19:17 is suggestive of the Lord's care for these unfortunates:

"He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto  
Yahweh,  
And his good deed will he pay him again."<sup>9</sup>

The original motivation of this attitude was the desire to implement the Biblical category of 'community' under the terms of the Covenant. The "poor" shared the privileges which the Covenant involved and special provision must be made to enable them to sense this fact.<sup>10</sup> In this circumstance, as Kohler has observed, "Charity is not a gift of condescending love, but a duty"<sup>11</sup> and the Mishnaic saying becomes intelligible, "If a man will not suffer the poor to glean or suffers one and not another, or aids one of them, he is a robber of the poor" (M. Peah 5:6). There must be no favoritism, for God plays no favorites and in the eyes of the Almighty the poor are all alike, for all are alike needy.

With the increase of wealth in Israel and its attendant profligacy, the term 'poor' took on a new and deeper meaning. This development began long before the exile, but its final issue became apparent only in the post-exilic Psalms (e.g. 34:6), in Deutero-Isaiah, and in Jeremiah, where the word became the practical synonym of "holy" (*qâdôsh*), "pious" (*hâsîd*), and "godly" (*šadîq*), and equivalent to the 'T' of the Psalter, the typical devout Israelite. The change in the connotation of

the word forms a sad commentary on the degeneracy of the times: the old socio-national basis of the Covenant relation in Israel had broken down. Still there was also advance here, for religious experience now took on a hitherto-unknown individualization (cf. Ezek 18:2) and in the new situation the "poor man" attained a new and more truly *religious* status. He became known as one who sensed, on the one hand, his dire need, and on the other, the fact that this need could be met only on the spiritual plane and through the attainment of a right relation with God. That is to say, in the emergency which faced the "poor man" in the breakdown of the Covenant community with its attendant privileges under the Law, a sense of spiritual poverty came to match that of physical or material want which had always been his lot.

Such was the character, then, of the "poor man" in the thinking of those addressed by our Lord.<sup>12</sup> And as Allen remarks, his consciousness of "spiritual poverty" constituted his "claim to the blessings promised in the next clause."<sup>13</sup> What these are, it is difficult to define. They are summarized in the phrase "Kingdom of God" which must find its final definition from a painstaking analysis of every passage in the Gospels in which it is used. However, here it must stand for some sort of present reality for the "poor man;" otherwise it would fail to contribute to his desired spiritual growth. Professor Ligon's analogy is relevant at this point. "The child," he writes apropos of this Beatitude, "must be given goals about which he can do something immediately, and reach relatively soon. As each one is reached, a higher one must be discovered for him."<sup>14</sup> So must it be with the "poor man." At first the 'kingdom' may mean for him no more than the vision of a *somewhat* that promises to fill up the aching void of his spiritual vacuity. But it must mean *at least* that to him in actual, present experience, or else God's Boon will prove at its very first stage a hollow mockery. And it seems certain in any case that moral or spiritual poverty can only be sensed in opposi-

tion to some perception, however inadequate, of its converse. In this embryonic sense, therefore, our Lord no doubt thought of the Kingdom of God as a present reality available for every man who sensed his inadequacy and spiritual immaturity.<sup>14</sup> This two-fold *realization* of one's vacuity and the Kingdom's fullness seems, indeed, to be the point in the *Parable of the Prodigal Son*, when of that one's first step in the direction of moral regeneration it is said, "But *when he came to himself* he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger" (Lk 15:17—'L')!

*Beatitude 2.* The 'mourners' of the second beatitude are the repentant in the Hebrew prophet's terminology, those who are troubled at the sinful state of the Covenant people. They see clearly that it is this "which checks and thwarts God's purposes for His people, and delays the coming of the kingdom" (Allen). This becomes clear from a comparison of such passages as Isaiah 57:18; 61:1ff, etc. Here with the coming salvation in view which the Lord holds out for His repentant people, He says

"I have seen his ways, and will heal him: I will lead him also, and *restore comforts* to him and to his *mourners*" (italics mine).

Mourning with fasting constituted in Israel the sign of true *repentance* or turning (*shûbh*) to God. It was not, it is true, to be taken as a substitute for repentance and so could not be equated with the latter in an absolute sense, but the association of the two ideas was such that the one could be taken as the symbol of the other. Similarly, the "comfort" acquired through God's saving purpose as elaborated by the Second Isaiah would be the assurance of forgiveness granted by God to a sinful people. The meaning of the second beatitude, then, is that *repentance* on man's part will result in forgiveness on God's. Such has been the teaching of Judaism throughout its history, as may be seen in such a passage as Joel 2:12ff, as well as in a famous saying like that from M. Yoma 8:8, "Repentance



effects atonement for lesser transgressions against both positive and negative commands in the Law; while for graver transgressions it suspends punishment until the Day of Atonement comes and effects atonement."

*Beatitude 3.* In the third beatitude *πραῖς* is variously rendered 'meek,' 'humble-minded,' and the like by the translators. But Psalm 37 as a whole, from whose 11th verse the beatitude is derived, serves to define the character in question. He is the man who in spite of adversity clings to his faith in the goodness and care of God for the righteous. Through thick and thin his trust is in Yahweh and thus he attains to a settled character of spiritual poise or serenity. The psalmist appears to transfer to such a one his own "unshakeable trust in divine providence" and his belief that "they who trust in Yahweh will enjoy permanent peace and quietude."<sup>15</sup> It seems obvious that in the beatitude the "land" of the psalm is to be understood in a metaphorical sense. The psalmist intended no doubt that those who trusted in adversity to God would find that eventually the land of their forefathers would be restored to them, whereas here 'land' will be the equivalent of the "Kingdom of God" and the promise will be essentially the same as that found in the first beatitude. It has often been remarked, moreover, that both in form and in eventual meaning (in the Hebrew), the 'poor man' (*ʾānī*) of the first beatitude and the 'meek man' (*ʾānāw*) of the third approximate each other. In the mind of the evangelist, however, there was no doubt real progress of thought from the first beatitude to the third. It was progress from an initial awareness of one's need to the settled attitude of trust in God alone which follows therefrom by a sort of spiritual necessity. The meaning of the beatitude, then, will be that the kingdom is acquired or arrived at in the end and in its richness and fullness only by such as exercise the trust in God needed to receive it. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein" (Mk 10:15); such is the essence of its teaching.

*Beatitude 4.* Craving for spiritual satisfaction was often expressed in the O.T. under the imagery of 'hunger' and 'thirst'.

"Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price".

"My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God".

"My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee, in a dry and weary land, where no water is". (Psalms 42:2; 63:1; Isaiah 55:1, etc.)

It is significant that the satisfaction craved is here expressed in terms of "righteousness," as this fact enables us to locate with a considerable degree of certainty the source material which forms the background of this beatitude. This is to be found in a series of passages of the Deutero-Isaiah (or Trito-, or both, according to one's critical analysis), wherein the imagery is expressive of the salvation God is about to afford his people. The word used by the prophet to define such "salvation" is "righteousness," a term difficult of exact definition and one whose meaning changes with the writer's moods and the particular aspect of salvation which he has in mind at the moment, but expressive certainly both of the character of Yahweh and of that which Israel is to receive from Him as a gift of His grace.<sup>16</sup> In the latter sense it includes at any rate, as Skinner observes, "the blessings conferred on Israel in token that its right is acknowledged and declared by God."<sup>17</sup> The equation of the two terms in question is brought out in a number of passages by means of the Hebrew method of synonymous parallelism, thus

"but my salvation shall be for ever,  
and my righteousness shall not be abolished"  
(51:6).

Salvation, then, in terms of a "righteousness" in the sight of God which confers certain spiritual blessings as well as temporal or material ones upon the people of God, is the final boon afforded in the 'Q' series of Beatitudes as adopted and arranged by "Matthew."

If the above line of investigation be correct, then there is here evidently the moral or spirit-

ual progress of a single individual adjudged as representative of the "sons of the kingdom," the stages of that progress being successively an awakening to one's state of inadequacy and moral poverty in the light of the gospel of the kingdom (Matt 4:23) however imperfectly understood at first; the determination to "turn" to God in repentance, accompanied by the assurance of the divine forgiveness; the adoption of a general attitude of trust in God alone, together with a sense of progressive achievement in the acquisition of the "land" (kingdom); and finally, the earnest longing to acquire the total "righteousness" which constitutes "salvation" for man. This moral progress is implicit in the Beatitudes themselves as arranged by "Matthew." The only question that remains, therefore, is whether there is elsewhere in Jesus' teaching any evidence to support the view that he taught after this fashion. The nearest parallel, point for point, is perhaps to be found in the *Parable of the Prodigal Son*, wherein the boy's moral development is portrayed from "realization" of his state ("he came to himself"), to "repentance" ("I will arise and go to my father"), thence to "trust" ("I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants"), and finally to "vindication" (or "justification," i.e., "righteousness" in one of its Deutero-Isaianic aspects, vs. 22-24). Lk 15:17-24 ('L'). That Jesus taught the various elements of this progression in one form and another is too well known and authenticated to require further demonstration. He took the entire series of ideas, of course, from the prophetic writings of the O.T. where they abound in profusion. Further, that the elements of this experience all have significance only if they are successively carried through to fruition on the historical plane is from the standpoint of both psychology and Biblical doctrine generally so clearly patent as to require no proof. Man does not hunger for God's "righteousness" until he has learned to put his faith in His essential goodness, nor manifest such trust in Him before he has "turned" toward God in "repentance," nor

turn toward Him until he has realized his own unworthiness. Moreover, it seems equally clear that here is no "*interims Ethik*" applicable to a limited period under ideal conditions, but rather a normal series of reactions on the part of men to situations arising in a very imperfect world and likely to prove normative for such situations as long as time lasts.

### Stanza II

When we turn to the second stanza of the beatitudes we find ourselves in an entirely different atmosphere. The positive note displaces the negative one and where before there had been apparent a feeling of emptiness, of an aching void seeking to be filled, there is here portrayed the richness of a personality capable of making a vital contribution to the life and uplift of mankind. In the arrangement adopted by "Matthew" this second series is the exposition of the "righteousness" or "salvation" mentioned in the last of the other series of beatitudes and, indeed, it proves to be such on any arrangement.

An observation which greatly helps forward both the exegesis of the second stanza and the solution of the critical problems which it presents is the simple one—overlooked by all the commentators apparently, that its structure and content are derived *in toto* from Psalm 85:10:

"Mercy and Truth are met together;  
Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other."

This contention is proved by the certain identity of three of the items chosen for discussion in the two passages (i.e., in Psalm and Beatitudes), viz., Mercy, Peace and Righteousness. True, the beatitude substitutes "cleansed at heart," (*καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ*) for "truth" of the Psalm (in the Hebr. 'emeth). This, however, is strictly in line with what one might expect from the Hebraic coloring of the stanza.

In the Hebrew tradition "truth" was of the essence of God's person and could be predicated of man only in a secondary or derived sense.

Thus, Hoskyns remarks, "The Hebrew mind, in its certainty of a transcendent God, fixed upon Him as the standard of Truth . . . the Truth of Jehovah was regarded as an integral part of His character."<sup>18</sup> G. F. Moore observes further that for Judaism "Truth ('emet) is the seal of God,"<sup>19</sup> an idea derived from the wording of Dan 10:21 and elaborated in the Talmud. He continues, "Since a seal usually bore the name of its owner, invention was exercised to find a name of God in this inscription. One took the letters as short-hand' the initials of three words, Elohim Melek Tamid, and interpreted, 'Living God and eternal king'" (so Jer 10:10).

Accordingly, it should not strike us as strange that in the O.T. in no single instance is "emet" (either noun or adjective) ever predicated of man.<sup>20</sup> The same is true for the New Testament, a fact which serves to illuminate the stress on Truth as found in Jesus which is made in the Johannine Literature. Paul's rejoinder to his Jewish critics in Romans 3:4, "God forbid: yea, let God be found true, but every man a liar," is an *argumentum ad hominem* which would certainly have silenced his opponents at this point and may be taken adequately to represent the views of both testaments.

Because of these facts it became necessary to adopt some other term for "true," "truth" so far as they concerned man, *one which would suggest a derived character*. This was done in the Old Testament in several ways: a) by substituting *kên* (fr. *kûn*) of man for 'emet as employed for God, both stems meaning, it is true, practically the same thing (viz., to be upright or perpendicular), but distinguished in this usage (as, e.g., at Gen 42:11, 19, 31, 33f); b) by the adoption of a word which would supply somewhat the same sense of derived "truth" or "sincerity," such as *bar lēbāb* (fr. *bārār*, to examine, choose, etc.), which the LXX translates either *καθαρός τῇ καρδίᾳ* (Ps 24:4); or *τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ* (Ps 73:1); *tāhār* or *tāhēr* (fr. *tāhēr*, to be (become) pure, clean, etc.), rendered in the LXX by *ἀγνὴν τὴν καρδίαν* (Prov 20:9; cf. Ps 51:10); *zāk* (fr. *zākak*, to be

clean, pure)—LXX *καθαρός* (and *ἀγνός*) in Job 8:6; Prov 21:8; *yāshār* (fr. *yāshar*, to be straight, even, etc.) LXX *ἀληθινός* at Job 8:6; Ps 7:10; Prov 21:18; or even by the verb 'aman or the adjective 'emūn from the same primitive root from which 'emet itself is derived—LXX *πιστός* (cf. Num 12:7; 2 Sam 20:19; Ps 31:23; Prov 20:6). In the last instance the English generally renders both the verb and adjective by "faithful" with a view to preserving the distinction of the Hebrew to which we are here referring.

In the present passage, therefore, one or other of these circumlocutions undoubtedly lies behind the Greek (*καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ*), most likely *bar lēbāb* (cf. Ps 24:4). And the suggestion that Psalm 85:10 is the source of the "M" stanza of the beatitudes appears to be as nearly demonstrated as the nature of the case will allow.

It becomes relevant, then, to enquire of the teaching of Psalm 85 and particularly of the 10th verse. We need not enter into the question of its date. For whether taken as exilic with Battenweiser who considers it the work of Deutero-Isaiah, or as post-exilic along with the great majority of commentators (e.g., Duhm, who writes of it as "etwa unter der Regierung des Simon entstanden;" Briggs, who says it is "of the late Persian period subsequent to Nehemiah;"<sup>21</sup> and Oesterley, who gives it no definite date but thinks it probably post-exilic<sup>21</sup>), there is at all events general recognition that the psalmist looks forward to something greater than the mere return from captivity. Oesterley has made the interesting suggestion that "the restoration of Jacob" referred to in v.1 (*š'būth ya 'aqōb*) is the technical phrase used by the prophets generally for "the bringing back of the time of primeval happiness, the 'Golden Age'," as this was "adopted by the prophets, who interpreted it as in reference to the 'Messianic Age'" (cf. Amos 9:14; Jer 33:14-16).<sup>22</sup> The psalm is thus an "eschatological psalm," as both Duhm and Battenweiser also agree.

The psalm divides itself into two parts, of which the first (vs. 1-7) constitutes the psalm-

ist's prayer for the "salvation" (*yeshu'a*) of his people. The second part (vs. 8-14) is a prophetic oracle introduced by the words, "I will hear what God Jehovah will speak" (v. 8a). The significant point for our purpose is that the definition of "salvation" which God is represented as giving is made up of the four terms of our beatitudes. Briggs makes the illuminating observation that, whereas truth and mercy are constantly united in the psalms (cf. 25:10; 40:11f; 57:4; 61:8; 115:1; 138:2), peace and righteousness are only so associated here in the O.T., as justice usually pairs off with righteousness there. *The repetition of this combination in the beatitudes, therefore, is the more striking and suggests that we are on right lines in finding the prototype of our second stanza in the psalm before us.*

The teaching of verse 10 against this background, then, is that in the eschatological time the four personified attributes of Yahweh mentioned will meet together to make their contributions to a restored and renovated earth. Each will afford what it has to give for the betterment of salvation of mankind. As all of these attributes belong to God or inhere in Him, it lies on the surface of such teaching that the salvation which they bring comes as a gift of His grace.

Turning back, now, to the beatitudes in the light of this study of the psalm, we shall content ourselves with making several observations which appear to be relevant: *first*, it appears obvious now that the second stanza of the beatitudes must be taken as a unit and either attributed to our Lord, or contrariwise to the evangelist, *in toto*! And there appears to be no good reason why Jesus may not have originated the four as they stand in the "M" tradition. It is true that the eighth at first blush appears to be a mere doublet of the ninth (from "Q") as already noted (above, pp. 2 and 3), but it is not impossible that Jesus uttered it both ways (i.e., in both "Q" and "M" forms). It is true that outside of "M" and the single passage in Jn 16:8-10, Jesus is not reported to have used the word "righteousness" in his teachings. This, however, is

surely a mere incident of the tradition and without significance. Its occurrence in Ps 85:10 would sufficiently account for his singular use of it here. Moreover, our Lord's use of the other attributes mentioned in the verse is too well authenticated to require demonstration. *The fact should not escape our observation that, if this conclusion is accepted, the techniques of both literary and form criticism failed to solve this problem.* It should be obvious, therefore, that however fine they may be (*and are*, in the writer's judgment at least), they need constantly to be checked by the equally adequate methods employed by the sciences of linguistics and of biblical theology.

*Second*, it is most striking that attributes which in the psalm belong to God should here be transferred to man! This can only be accounted for on the assumption that the stanza was uttered in some such "salvation" context as that provided in stanza one. Man's goodness is always represented in Scripture as the mere reflection or image of God's; it is everywhere secondary and derived and the product of a "salvation" which is a gift of God's grace. The assumption underlying this stanza is, therefore, that the "salvation" provided by the Messianic Age or in the eschatological time as envisaged in the psalm, has arrived by the time that these beatitudes find their fulfilment in man's experience. They are the attributes of men living in and partaking of the grace provided by God in that eschatological time.

But *third*, it seems equally obvious that they are attributes which are required in an imperfect world which knows nothing of the blessings of the Messianic "salvation." For where is mercy needed save in an age of ruthlessness? Where do men require to learn sincerity of motivation except where faithlessness is the rule of the day? Do men bring peace except in a world where there is no peace? And who is persecuted for his "righteousness" in a perfect world and under ideal conditions?

It seems, then, that the poet is sketching a saved personality forced to live in an unsaved world, righteousness surrounded by vice, with



the consequent tensions thus created. The Kingdom of God has come for those who are being saved, but for those who are not it is afar off! God's people are living the kingdom life in an imperfect world; they are, to use Barth's expressive phrase, "zwischen den Zeiten."

*Fourth*, the eschatology conceived in this second stanza, as in the first, is a prophetic one rather than of an apocalyptic type. This had already been noted by commentators to be true of the psalm in question.<sup>23</sup> Both psalmist and the author of the beatitudes conceived of a renovated earth in which dwelleth righteousness, not of one removed and apart from our world. This fact, be it noted, is another (and perhaps one should say, final) demonstration that *the beatitudes of the second stanza are from Jesus and not the creation of the church, for there can be no doubt that the eschatology of the church was of the apocalyptic type.*

*Finally*, the elements of this prophetic eschatology, i.e., of the kingdom in its temporal manifestation, will be (in the order of the second stanza's beatitudes but stated in modern terminology): a *social ethic* of which "mercy" like to God's is the ruling principle and without which men have no right to expect God's mercy to apply to them, a thought entirely in line with our Lord's teaching elsewhere (cf. Mk 11:25); *true religion* on the part of a purified people who, like the "pure in heart" of Psalm 24:4<sup>24</sup> are worthy to enter into the Temple of God and to enjoy His fellowship; *evangelism*, or the making of peace through the Gospel of peace between those afar off and those who are nigh and of both with God (Isa 52:7; 57:18-21; cf. Eph 2:13ff); and the acquisition of that righteousness which is the true *Imago Dei* and which is at once *salvation* for man and his chief end. Here surely is a program which has relevance for our imperfect world and one which is calculated to challenge us to well-rounded Christian living on a very high plane.

### III

Regarding the ninth Beatitude (from "Q," in 'Matthew's' series the application of the poem to Jesus' disciples), I shall content myself

with but one observation. It is significant that persecution of the disciples is associated here with the "Son of Man" concept, as in the "M" series the same is true in conjunction with that of "righteousness." In neither case is there any justification for this treatment of the concept to be found in the Old Testament background from which it arises. There is no mention of persecution "for righteousness sake" in Psalm 85, nor does any occur with reference to the "Son of Man" in Dan 7:13 (nor for that matter in I Enoch, chaps. 37 to 71, which some, mistakenly in my judgment, hold to be the origin of Jesus' use of the phrase). Persecution for the sake of the Son of Man is a motif superimposed upon the concept, therefore, as it is also upon the ideas found in Ps 85:10 with which we have dealt in connection with stanza two. Whence did this motif arise and why attach it to these two concepts? It is striking, to say the least, that the same phenomenon occurs in the synoptic gospels again and again in connection with the "Son of Man" and that it is attributed to Jesus.<sup>25</sup> The conclusion appears to suggest itself, therefore, that neither the "Q" nor "M" beatitudes are from Jesus' tongue, or if they are, that they form a striking addition to the evidence that he took the persecution or suffering motif attaching normally to the "Suffering Servant" of the Deutero-Isaiah and transferred the same to the "Son of Man"!

### REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> The original Beatitudes in stanza one above were probably nearer to Lk's version in *form* (6:20f), to Mtt's in *spirit* (5:3-6). The present rendering is an attempt to exhibit the excellencies of both these drafts. The ninth Beatitude in Mtt's series was probably intended by him as the application of the others to the particular situation confronting Jesus' immediate disciples; it is given here in the form adopted by the revisers of the ASV at Lk 6:22f. The endeavor is made throughout to show the particular aspect of "Blessedness" involved in each Beatitude by the play noted on the translation of the adjective μακάριοι.

<sup>2</sup> So, e.g., Martin Dibelius in *From Tradition to Gospel*—1935, p. 247; but *per contra*, cf. C. F. Burney's *The Poetry of Our Lord*—1925, pp. 165ff.

<sup>3</sup> The textual apparatus is that provided in S. C. E. Legg's *Novum Testamentum Graece* in loc.

<sup>4</sup> These arguments are substantially as advanced by W. C. Allen in Comm. on *Matthew* (I.C.C.) and Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (in *Kom. zum Neuen Test.*); cf. also T. W. Manson in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*—1938. The latter thinks the 3rd Beatitude may belong to 'M'.

<sup>5</sup> *The Message of Jesus Christ*—1939, p. 62.

<sup>6</sup> *From Tradition to Gospel*, p. 247.

<sup>7</sup> *Message*, pp. 158f.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. art. 'Poor' in HDB (Driver) and in Westminster DB.

<sup>9</sup> Further in G. F. Moore's *Judaism*, vol. ii, pp. 168f.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. P. S. Minear, art. on "The Biblical Sense of Community" in JRT, Vol. i, No. 2, 1944.

<sup>11</sup> *Jewish Theology*—1918, p. 487.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Allen, op. cit. in loc; also J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*—1930, pp. 89ff.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Manson, op. cit., p. 339.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also the *Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican* (Lk 18:14—'L').

<sup>15</sup> Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms*, Vol. I, pp. 222, 225.

<sup>16</sup> Skinner, Comm. on *Isaiah* (Cambr. Bible), vol. ii, pp. 240, 242.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 242. cf. Isa 46:13; 51:5, 6, 8; 56:1; 61:10; 62:1, etc.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. his *The Riddle of the New Testament*—1931, p. 38.

<sup>19</sup> Op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 194f.

<sup>20</sup> There appears to be one exception to this at Neh 7:2, where, however, the context makes it clear that the meaning of the term is 'faithful' or perhaps better 'man of Truth' (cf. 'men of Truth' at Exod 18:21). Prov 14:25 also uses the term as an adjective modifying "witness"—an ideal abstraction.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Oesterley, op. cit. vol. ii, pp. 382f; Duhm, *Psalmen*, p. 217; Briggs, *The Psalms*, p. 231.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Oesterley, op. cit.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Oesterley, op. cit., Bittenweiser, op. cit.

<sup>24</sup> The 'sincere at heart' of the Beatitude, like the *bar lebab* of Ps 24:4, is to be worthy of going up to Zion to appear before God; so that it is likely *bar lebab* was in the Beatitude author's mind when he wrote and that he would have chosen this as an appropriate substitute for 'emeth among the possibilities above suggested. (p. 9)

<sup>25</sup> It will perhaps be sufficient to refer here to my own *The Intention of Jesus*—1943, pp. 143–153.

# Research Abstracts

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

With this issue of the Journal, we begin an experiment in abstracting current researches in religion. Responsibility for organizing and directing this project has been given to J. Paul Williams, Research Editor of the Journal. The areas in which abstracts will be made are Old Testament, New Testament, Archaeology, Psychology of Religion, Sociology of Religion, Religious Education, Church History, Theology and Philosophy of Religion. Each issue of the Journal will contain one or more sets of abstracts. We shall appreciate comments from our readers giving their reactions to this experiment.

THE EDITOR.

## RESEARCH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT (1946)

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER\*

1. *History*. R. de Vaux, "Les Patriarches hébreux et les découvertes modernes" (*RB* 53, 321-348; to be continued). The patriarchs are historical and lived in the period 2000-1700 B.C.; a history of Palestine and Syria during this period.

B. Couroyer, "La résidence ramesside du Delta et le Ramsès biblique" (*RB* 53, 75-98). An analysis of all the known data shows that the site of Per-Ramses (Raamses in Ex. 1:11) is still unknown.

A. Guillaume, "The Habiru, the Hebrews and the Arabs" (*PEQ* 78, 64-85). The Habiru are the nomad Arabs ('*abiru* was changed to '*aribu*'), as also the Hebrews.

C. U. Wolf, "Some Remarks on the Tribes and Clans of Israel" (*JQR* 36, 287-295); "Terminology of Israel's Tribal organization" (*JBL* 65, 45-49). Studies on the origin, early history, and subdivisions of the tribes of Israel.

R. E. Wolfe, "Samuel, the Enigma" (*JBR* 14, 203-208). An attempt to reconstruct the career and character of Samuel, concluding that his pretensions to leadership after he retired at the age of about 60 years undid the work of his youth and wrecked the nation.

\* ROBERT H. PFEIFFER is Lecturer and Curator of the Semitic Museum at Harvard University, Lecturer at the Boston University School of Theology, and Editor of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. He is the author of *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941).

All publications listed appeared in 1946, and this date is regularly omitted.

ABBREVIATIONS. *BASOR*: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. *Bibl.*: *Biblica* (Rome). *Bibl. Arch.*: The Biblical Archaeologist. *CQ*: Crozer Quarterly. *HUCA*: Hebrew Union College Annual. *JAOS*: Journal of the American Oriental Society. *JBR*: Journal of Bible and Religion. *JBL*: Journal of Biblical Literature. *JNES*: Journal of Near Eastern Studies. *JQR*: Jewish Quarterly Review. *JTS*: Journal of Theological Studies. *Mun. Stud.*: *Munera Studiosa* (Edited by M. H. Shepherd, Jr., and Sh. E. Johnson); Cambridge, Mass., Episcopal Theological School, pp. 182. *PEQ*: Palestine Exploration Quarterly. *RB*: *Revue Biblique*.

Sh. A. Blank, "The Dissident Laity in Early Judaism" (*HUCA* 19, 1-42). Democratic tendencies in Judea opposed priestly rights and prerogatives.

E. C. Broome, Jr., "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality" (*JBL* 65, 277-292). The symptoms disclosed by Ezekiel in his book lead to the diagnosis of his psychotic condition as paranoid schizophrenia.

W. F. Albright, "A Brief History of Judah from the Days of Josiah to Alexander the Great" (*Bibl. Arch.* 9, 1-16). A summary study of the reform of Josiah, the fall of Judah, the exile, the restoration, the work of Nehemiah and of Ezra, and the hierocratic Jewish commonwealth of the 4th century.

I. Mendelsohn, "Slavery in the Ancient Near East" (*Bibl. Arch.* 9, 74-88). The sources, the legal status, and the economic role of ancient slavery are concisely described.

D. Daube, "The Last Chapter of Esther" (*JQR* 37, 139-147). Like the mediaeval Jews, the Jewish subjects of Ahasuerus welcomed taxation (as introduced by Mardocai) in place of the plundering proposed by Haman.

E. Teubler, "Jerusalem from 201 to 199 B.C.E." (*JQR* 37, 1-30; 125-137; to be continued). As a result of the war between Antiochus III the Great and Ptolemy V Epiphanes in 201-198 a Messianic movement began in Jerusalem, but soon failed.

2. *Hebrew Philology*. F. R. Blake, "The Form of Verbs after *waw* in Hebrew" (*JBL* 65, 51-57). A survey of all possible constructions. F. R. Blake, "Studies in Semitic Grammar" (*JAOS* 66, 212-218). On some points of comparative Semitic phonetics.

*Etymological and semantic studies of Hebrew roots, words, and expressions*. G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name of Israel in the Old Testament*. Uppsala: Appelberg, pp. 334. S. I. Feigin, *Ḥamôr gārīm*, "Castrated Ass" (*JNES* 5, 230-233). See Gen. 49:14; the expression is usually rendered "bony ass," or "strong ass." B. Maisler, "Canaan and Canaanites" (*BASOR* No. 102,

7-12). In the 15th century the term "Canaan" developed from the meaning of "trader" to that of both Phoenicia and the Egyptian province of Syria, and also came to signify a specific article of trade, i.e., red purple. H. Torczyner, "Semel ha-qin'ah ha-maqneh" (*JBL* 65, 293-302). "The image of jealousy, which provoketh jealousy" (Ez. 8:3) is in reality "the agent of deliverance who makes deliverance doubly sure." E. Zolli, "Note di lessicografia biblica," I (*Bibl.* 27, 127-128). There are two roots *y'f*: 1. to run fast, tire; 2. to ascend, shine (metatesis of *yf*). S. Moscati, "Sull'etimologia di *kôkab*" (*Bibl.* 27, 269-272). *Kôkab* (star) comes from *kbb* (to burn, shine). S. Moscati, "La radice semitica 'mr'" (*Bibl.* 27, 115-126). This root develops four meanings: 1. to see; 2. to indicate; 3. to say; 4. to command; cf. *indico*, *dico*, *indico*.

3. *Canonical and Non-Canonical Literature*. H. Hoepfl, *Introductio specialis in Vetus Testamentum*. 5th edit., revised by A. Miller and A. Metzinger. Rome: A. Amodo. The first edition of this standard Roman Catholic manual appeared in 1922.

J. E. Steinmueller and Kathryn Sullivan, *A Companion to the Old Testament*. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, pp. vii + 406. A more popular presentation of Steinmueller's *Special Introduction to the Old Testament* (which has appeared with a more elaborate bibliography in its fifth printing): excellent presentations of the Roman Catholic points of view.

G. E. Wright, "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1" (*JNES* 5, 105-114). Contrary to the current critical views, Josh. 10 (despite some inaccuracies) is a better account of the conquest of Canaan than Judg. 1.

C. L. Taylor, "The Psalms" (*Mun. Stud.*, 3-21). A valuable summary of research on the Psalter.

W. A. Irwin, "Poetic Structure in the Dialogue of Job" (*JNES* 5, 26-39). The strophes organized themselves into stanzas; couplets are more common than triads; most lines are distichs, but the existence of original tristichs should not be doubted. The poetic structure is generally uniform.

E. J. Bickerman, "The Edict of Cyrus in Ezra I" (*JBL* 45, 249-275). Cyrus promulgated his edict in Ezra I by herald and poster, like the Roman *edictum*.

H. F. D. Sparks, "The Origin of 'Darius the Mede' and Daniel 5:31" (*JTS* 47, 41-46). Since Haggai and Zechariah prophesied in the 2nd and 4th year of Darius, the author of Daniel inferred that "Darius the Mede" was the conqueror of Babylon, not Cyrus.

C. C. Torrey, "Medes and Persians" (*JAOS* 66, 1-15). An explanation of the Jewish conception of Medo-Persian relations (at variance with the facts) preserved in the Chronicler's writings, Daniel, I Esdras (the Three Guardsmen), Esther, Tobit, etc.

C. C. Torrey, "A Twice-buried Apocalypse" (*Mun. Stud.*, 23-39). II Esdras (IV Ezra) is an expansion of the Visions of Shealtiel (chs. 3-13 only), dating from 69 A.D.

C. C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation*. *JBL*, Monograph Series, Vol. I. Philadelphia, Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, pp. 53. The Greek text, preserved in the writings of Epiphanius, is the translation of a Hebrew book published in Palestine in the first century of our era.

4. *Exegesis*. E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Job*. New York: Sheed and Ward. A good Roman Catholic commentary.

*Soncino Books of the Bible*, edited by A. Cohen. V. E. Richert, *Job*. Pp. xx + 233. S. M. Lehman, J. J. Slotki, S. Goldman, V. E. Reichert, and A. Cohen, *The Five Megilloth*. Pp. xiii + 252. Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino Press. Masoretic Text, English translation of the Jewish Publication Society of America, and a brief, clear, popular commentary.

PENTATEUCH. F. Zimmermann, "An Examination of some Biblical Passages" (*JBL* 65, 311-314): Gen. 1:1; Ex. 2:6; Lev. 19:35; Num. 10:31; Deut. 1:33. A. S. Yahuda, Calneh in Shinar (*JBL* 45, 325-327): Gen. 10:10. I. Sonne, Genesis 49:25-26 (*JBL* 65, 303-306).

T. Piatti, "Una nuova interpretazione del Cantico di Debora" (*Bibl.* 27, 65-106; 161-209; 434). A most elaborate study of Judg. 5, including the investigation of its significance, historical background, standard Hebrew text, metrical analysis, textual criticism, and former reconstructions; and a new reconstruction of the text, with its translation and commentary.

J. W. Wevers, "Double Readings in the Book of Kings" (*JBL* 65, 307-310). Evidence of ancient variants derived from Hebrew variants, Greek versions, and Masoretic Text.

F. North, "The Oracle against the Ammonites in Jer. 49:1-6" (*JBL* 65, 37-43). A textual reconstruction.

PSALMS. P. Auvray, "Le Psaume I" (*RB* 53, 365-371). Grammatical and exegetical notes on Ps. 1. I. Sonne, "The Second Psalm" (*HUCA* 19, 43-55). To our surprise, Ps. 2 is dated in 720 B.C., when Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz. J. Morgenstern, "Psalms 8 and 19A" (*HUCA* 19, 491-523). Ps. 8 is dated in the 4th or early 3rd centuries; Ps. 19:2-7 in 516-485. J. Morgenstern, "Psalm 23" (*JBL* 65, 13-24). A textual reconstruction. Th. H. Gaster, "Psalm 29" (*JQR* 37, 55-65). Ps. 29 is a praise of the victorious deity which was sung as part of the pantomime of the New Year Festival.

5. *Ancient and Modern Versions*. THE SEPTUAGINT. H. M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint—Its Use in Textual Criticism" (*Bibl. Arch.* 9, 22-34). A brief survey of Septuagintal research. F. V. Filson, "The Septuagint and the New Testament" (*Bibl. Arch.* 9, 34-42). A clear summary. H. M. Orlinsky, *Hä-rôqdm* for *hâ-rôqdm* in II Sam. 6:20 (*JBL* 65, 25-35). The LXX reading is preferable to the Masoretic one. P. Katz, *Katapousai* as a corruption of *katalusai* in the LXX (*JBL* 65, 319-324); "Notes on the Septuagint" (*JTS* 47, 30-33; 166-169). A. Wickgren, "Two Ostraca



Fragments of the LXX Psalter" (*JNES* 5, 181-184): Pss. 20 (21):1-5; 30 (31):1-8.

M. P. Stapleton, "Catholic Bible Translations" (*JBR* 14, 198-202). An accurate report of biblical translations in progress or recently published.

6. *Religion of Israel*. P. Humbert, *La "terou'a"*: *Analyse d'un rite biblique*. Université de Neuchâtel (Switzerland), pp. 48. The *teru'a* (battle cry, shout of joy) is a collective manifestation in war and in the rite of the coronation of Jehovah as king. It is a specifically Israelitic rite.

W. A. Faus, *The Genius of the Prophets*. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, pp. 190. A study of the prophetic movement and of its meaning for to-day.

S. Kraus, "The Jewish Rite of Covering the Head" (*HUCA* 19, 121-168). A detailed study of the sources leads to the conclusion that covering the head was not compulsory in ancient times for Jewish laymen in the performance of religious rites.

A. George, "Fautes contre Yahweh dans les livres de Samuel" (*RB* 53, 161-184). A detailed survey of religious sins in the Books of Samuel (violation of what is holy, errors in ritual, offenses against God himself) leads to the conclusion that a religious progress can be detected, going from wrong acts to more subtle sins such as the lure of idolatry and polytheism.

R. Koch, "Der Gottesgeist und der Messias" (*Bibl.* 27, 241-268; 376-403). An elaborate examination of the Messiah and of the Servant of the Lord in the Second Isaiah.

7. *Old Testament Theology*. M. Burrows, "The Task of Biblical Theology" (*JBR* 14, 13-15). Biblical theology must consider ethics, sociology, economics, and politics, as well as beliefs; and it must make the religious resources of the Bible available through a presentation of biblical research.

R. C. Dentan, "The Nature and Function of Old Testament Theology" (*JBR* 14, 16-21). After a survey of the historical development of Old Testament theology, the author stresses the need of an attitude of faith in all branches of biblical study.

Mary E. Lyman, "The Unity of the Bible" (*JBR* 14, 5-12). Stresses the value not only of critical

discrimination of the differences in various parts of the Bible, but also in the realization of the basic unity of biblical religion.

M. Burrows, *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia, Westminster Press, pp. xi + 380. A clear and comprehensive treatment stressing Christian doctrine more than Old Testament religion.

H. Wh. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, pp. 298. This posthumous volume deals with God's relations with nature, man, and history; prophetic inspiration; the priestly oracle, wisdom, and the Psalmists. Thus it covers a considerable part of Old Testament theology.

H. H. Rowley, *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, pp. 314. Although in appearance is a survey of all phases of Old Testament research, in reality it is a presentation of the religious values of the Old Testament, notably as fulfilled in the New. See also his booklet, *The Unity of the Old Testament* (from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, pp. 35).

N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, pp. 251. Important Hebrew religious terms (notably those referring to the attributes of the deity) are discussed and their echoes in the New Testament are pointed out.

J. B. Pritchard, "The Hebrew Theologian and his Foreign Colleagues" (*CQ* 23, 21-33). The work of Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Hebrew theologians is illustrated by their views on God's creation of the world.

J. C. Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. xii + 128. A good general study of Hebrew (and Jewish-Hellenistic) wisdom literature (and its Babylonian and Egyptian backgrounds), together with its development from reason to revelation.

L. H. Brockington, "The Hebrew Conception of Personality in Relation to the Knowledge of God" (*JTS* 47, 1ff.). Out of the three basic elements of man (the sense of self-identity, of individuality, and of personal power) emerges the awareness and knowledge of God.

---

## Book Reviews

---

### History of Religions

*Religion on the American Frontier 1783-1840.*

Vol. IV. *The Methodists*. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. ix + 800 pages. \$10.00.

This valuable source book of the Methodist expansion in America is the thickest of the four volumes in the series in which it appears; the second volume, *The Presbyterians*, however, has a good many more pages, though in somewhat larger type than that here employed. The terminal date for Volume IV is the same as for Volume II, 1840, while Vol. I, *The Baptists*, stops at 1830 and Vol. III, *The Congregationalists*, extends to 1850. Actually, and fortunately, the announced dates are not too rigidly applied. In his preface to the present volume Professor Sweet acknowledges more assistance from his students than in the earlier ones, noting especially "the careful and scholarly editing" of Mr. Donald H. Yoder. Together the four volumes offer a unique body of primary material, selected with expert skill, exposing to view a previously neglected, yet highly important field of American history. The series can still be profitably expanded, but the major task has now been done.

The General Introduction (pp. 3-70), in four chapters, presents a brief history of American Methodism to 1840, and (in Chapter III) a concise account of the Methodist polity as it evolved on American soil. Professor Sweet notes that the organizing conference of 1784 was "a new kind of Methodist conference," since it "decided all matters by majority vote." Nevertheless the expanding work was directed by the bishops and presiding elders. Three quarters of a century from the time of its first appearance in America, Methodism attained numerical leadership among Protestant denominations. Dr. Sweet agrees with early observers and leaders of the movement that the itineracy of the preachers was the prime factor

in its phenomenal spread on the frontier. Bishop Asbury himself, in forty-five years on horseback, set a mileage record and an example. Yet we may be sure that if it had not been sustained by what a Presbyterian in 1843 called "the zeal, devoted piety and efficiency" of the circuit-riders themselves, this "Methodist economy" of the itinerant ministry would have proved a dismal failure. Dr. Sweet has not stressed this point, but it is an inference from his documents and from the whole body of history which they illumine. Many will read these records for their intimate and varied pictures of frontier life, the crudity and energy of which is the better conveyed by the ingenious misspelling practised by some of the writers. Thus Richard Whatcoat, Dec. 29, 1789:

Crost pops or Turks Ferry about the Tim that  
Twilight Lef the Sky But the Horses had liket To have  
Sunk the Skew to Deep But thanks be To Kind providence  
we Got Safe To the Wido Dugleses about Eight  
Oh Clock

But the religious reader will dwell rather upon such passages as that written three days later in which this devout evangelist reflects on a year of blessings:

But Glory be to God in April the Cloud Brok and the  
pilors of Hell Began to Tremble . . . But I want to  
Sink Deeper into God and To Bring fourth More frute  
Lord Help

Much more self-revealing is Benjamin Lakin, a native of Maryland whose journal has the religious quality of the Puritan diary of earlier days (such as that of Samuel Ward edited by M. M. Knappen), while recording a totally different routine of activities. On a Sunday in 1794, he writes:

I awoke with a deep sense of the low state of Zion  
my soul wept over the church my soul was engaged for  
the Lord to revive his work.

Accordingly he preached, under four appropriate headings, on "these awfull words. And in

Hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Lakin has all the exaltations and depressions of the pilgrim heavenward. He is often deeply concerned for the Church and the nation, as well as for his own spiritual state, habitually in earnest prayer, and sometimes seized by an ardor of devotion. A man of some talent, he knew the temptation of pride. A typical outcry of his soul is: "God keep me little and make me unknown in the world!" This fascinating journal, written "as I rode examining myself," reveals an unusual religious personality and sheds light upon aspects of frontier Methodism that may too readily be overlooked.

Hardly less interesting is the collection of letters addressed to Edward Dromgoole, an Irishman by birth and a former Roman Catholic, who served the Methodist cause in Maryland and Virginia for more than half a century. The first of these, a little classic of its kind, is John Hagerty's account of his religious experience—which typically moves through the stages of conviction, conversion, and sanctification. Among Dromgoole's other correspondents are Philip Gatch and Peter Pelham who, having migrated to Ohio through dislike of the slave economy of the South, here express their pious hopes that slavery may never take root in their adopted land. Lakin, too, deplors "the curse of Negro slavery," while James Keys writes from Tennessee lamenting that he has ever owned slaves.

A frontier epic is revealed in the letters of Orceneth Fisher, who, with his Baptist father's delayed approval, "took solemn leave of home to go out into the wide western world," and after periods in Indiana and Texas pursued his fruitful career in California and Oregon and ended fifty-eight years of service in Texas in 1880. The missions to the Indians in Kansas furnish another set of valuable documents. Here Jerome Berryman pleased the Kickapoos by his abounding appetite and disclosed the hypocrisy of their prophet Ke-en-e-kuk who having espoused Christianity began to administer ritual floggings to his deluded converts. The records of quarterly conferences fill about

ninety pages. Of more general interest are the reports of trials under the austere discipline imposed upon preachers and lay members. It is not sex offenses that predominate here, though a few are noted, but matters of dishonesty and maladministration. The cases seem to have been adjudicated dispassionately after a fair presentation of evidence. A chapter is devoted to materials illustrating book publication and distribution, and another to frontier deeds, circuit plans, camp-meeting rules, sermons and an "exhortation." We have many references, in the journals quoted, to the exhortation as distinct from the sermon: the one here reported assails ill-behavior in church, each offender being indicated by the finger of the exhorter, and the offense described in scathing terms. Thus it happens that our last document closes with a reference to "that dirty, nasty, filthy tobacco-chewer, sitting on the end of that front seat."

There is an ample bibliography of thirty-eight pages. A commendable feature of the book is the multitude of footnotes, many of which consist of brief sketches of the careers of persons referred to by the writers. The twenty-seven page index enables the reader to recover readily most of the data in the notes.

No amount of narrative history could give the reader that awareness of the realities of religion on the frontier that is aroused by the perusal of these documents. They enable us to live in the past as if it were the present. The sinewy strength of youth and the indomitable energy of faith are revealed in this book, in which a mature historian celebrates the triumph of young Methodism in young America.

JOHN T. MCNEILL

*Union Theological Seminary,  
New York City.*

*The History of the Jews of Italy.* By CECIL ROTH. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946. xiv + 575 pages. \$3.00.

Cecil Roth has shown himself particularly gifted with the ability to select episodes and characters from Jewish history which are ex-

tremely fascinating. *The History of the Marranos, The Life of Menasseh ben Israel* and the volume which is being considered in this review, to cite but three of his titles, serve to exemplify the captivating quality of his choice of subject matter.

In writing of the Jews of Italy, Roth is dealing with a notably long and colorful epoch in the history of his people. In the centuries which intervened between their settlement in Rome in the second century B.C. and the collapse of the Nazi-Fascist armies in 1945 the Italian Jews experienced both the depths of suffering and the heights of good fortune. In many periods expulsions and impoverishment pushed them perilously near the brink of extinction. From time to time in the Middle Ages a Bernardino or Capistrano went through the country carrying on a frenzied preachment against the Jews. Mobs would be formed and to some such resounding cry as *Viva Maria, e periscono gli ebrei* Jewish blood would be shed. Perhaps the greatest catastrophe which befell the Jews before the alliance of Mussolini and Hitler was the enforcement of the ghetto pattern of life by certain Popes of the period of the Catholic Reaction. On July 12, 1555 Paul IV issued his Bull, *Cum nimis absurdum*, with its fantastic variety of proscriptions which reduced the Jews to almost unbelievable misery and poverty. This Bull set the pattern of papal policy which, with a few notable exceptions, was followed until the *Risorgimento*.

Further elaboration of the darker aspects of Italian Jewish history would yield a distorted perspective. Roth time and again indicates the favorable situation of the Jews of Italy as compared with the status of their coreligionists elsewhere in Europe. He also enumerates many occasions when the Italian people with their characteristic generosity and kindliness refused to be driven to acts of persecution by bigoted leaders. As a case in point, during the Nazi occupation thousands of lives were saved because both private citizens and functionaries of the church at great risk to themselves gave shelter to Jewish refugees.

Roth is a historian and not an apologist.

This is fortunate because the historical facts which he presents so objectively are the best possible refutation of a multitude of misconceptions. For instance, many people have derived their opinions on loan banking in Italy from a reading of *The Merchant of Venice*. As a consequence the idea has grown that the Jews of Medieval Italy were thoroughly parasitical. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The loan banks were highly beneficial to the welfare of the people as demonstrated on many occasions by the misery which followed their closing. Furthermore, when they were allowed to do so, the Jews engaged in a great variety of other occupations. Wherever they went they carried with them skills and a fund of knowledge which made it possible for them to excel in certain lines of production which other sections of the population did not have the ability to develop or carry on. The result was that an expulsion of Jews from a city or a larger area proved to be a double tragedy. Besides despoiling the Jews it wrecked the economic well-being of the non-Jews. That this was often understood is shown by the ludicrous spectacle of many an unprincipled duke greedily clinging to his Jewish subjects, to the end that he might continue to exploit them and enjoy the benefits of their industry for his realm, in spite of the tremendous pressure brought to bear on him by a fanatical friar bent on their expulsion.

Roth's entire book is a massive documentation of the fact that one of a nation's greatest assets is to be found in people with enough integrity and vigor to maintain their culture pattern in the midst of a hostile or indifferent environment and that one of a nation's greatest liabilities is to be found in the witch-hunters who are bent on forcing everyone to conform to their brand of mediocrity.

EUGENE S. TANNER

*The University of Tulsa*

*The World's Great Scriptures.* By LEWIS BROWNE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. xvi + 559 pages. \$5.00.

This anthology of the great scriptures of the



world has been prepared to accompany the author's famous *This Believing World*, which has gone through thirty-seven printings in various languages since its original publication in 1926. If it should achieve anything like the success of its predecessor, it would add a great deal to the religious literacy of our generation. The book is attractively printed and enlivened by the author's own woodcuts throughout. It should take its place as a standard work to which the popular reader in this field may be referred. Such a book as this should be in the library of every educated person. The philologists have translated a vast quantity of the religious writings of mankind during the past century, but it takes books like this to make them available for the general reader. Of the several efforts to give these scriptures to the layman, this is one of the most attractive.

Here one finds beautiful fragments from ancient Babylonia and Egypt, with fuller selections from Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism. A good deal of it is set in poetic form. There is nothing from the ancient Greeks and Romans; nothing from Shinto, Sikhs, Jains, Bahaists, Mormons or Christian Scientists. The author omitted these because he felt that their limited influence in the world did not justify including them.

Concern with ethics and morality is the underlying principle which has determined the selection. Writings preoccupied with God and the supernatural have been deliberately omitted. Browne observes that while religions show the widest diversity in theology, they are remarkably agreed as to how a man ought to treat his neighbor. It is this common ethical treasure of the religions of the world which he attempts to present.

Criticism, of course, is obvious. Religion has generally grounded morality in the supernatural. This book tends to suggest that theology is unimportant and that it has no necessary relation to morals. It seems to ignore the question of ultimate truth, which has been religion's main concern. Whoever would understand a religion must study its

legends, myths and theology, as well as its morality.

The shortcomings of the method become very clear in the selections from Judaism and Christianity. How can anyone conceive of these religions without their creation stories? Even the garden of Eden story is omitted. In this reviewer's opinion, the story of Adam and Eve is the finest example of literary art from antiquity, as well as the most profound analysis of morality that has come from the mind of man. The ethical literature of Judaism is otherwise presented with great fulness, including fine sayings from Apocrypha, Mishna and Gemara. The literature of Christianity is allowed to appear much less extensive by comparison. A balanced presentation would show that the Old Testament is also Christian scripture. Moreover, if one is selecting from apocryphal and rabbinic works for Judaism, a similar principle would seem to require some recognition of choice sayings of church fathers, such as Augustine, for example, who have been so important in Christian thought.

S. VERNON McCASLAND

*University of Virginia*

*They Have Found a Faith.* By MARCUS BACH. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1946. 300 pages. \$3.00.

Here is a new kind of treatment of eight of the larger American minority religious groups. It is the result of first hand personal contact with living leaders or members of the groups by one who is thoroughly sympathetic with them and deeply understanding of the motives which have led people to seek membership in them.

Marcus Bach is a professor of religion at the University of Iowa. Apparently he had a Guggenheim Fellowship awarded him for study of these dissident religious movements in America, and travelled widely over America observing them under many conditions and in many places. The general plan was to get the inside story of the cults from either their founders or leaders, then to study the operation of the cult in the daily lives of the members.

He did very little book work, or at least very little evidence of that appears in his writing. The book is entirely innocent of footnotes, which, from the standpoint of the general reader may be effective, but from that of the interested scholar is a definite defect. Even where reference is made to book statements no effort is made to locate other than in the most general terms the source from which it was taken. Nor is there any index in the volume, a most woeful lack and quite inexcusable. It limits an otherwise very useful book very greatly, for there is no way of looking up anything without doing more reading than one can usually do when he is looking for some single item of information. The book, therefore, while the most interesting and indeed intriguing book that I have personally seen in the field fails, at a point where it need not have done so, to meet a much felt need among scholars and teachers of religion.

It may have been the author's definite intention to write for the general public, not the scholar. It probably was. Certainly no book has made these religions live as Bach has managed to do. No book has caught up so well the inner meaning of these groups as he has done and incidentally no one has written on the cults so interestingly and even charmingly as he has done. It is a very welcome and valuable addition to a field in which there has been all too little material published.

One cannot accompany Professor Bach as he makes his rounds for example with a humble worker of Jehovah's Witnesses, going with him into homes, helping manipulate the propaganda phonograph and listening to the earnest conviction with which the Witness urges his faith upon the listener without getting a new appreciation of what this cult is doing and what it means to those who are within it. Maybe this is better than any number of book references that might be made to what Jehovah's Witnesses believe and do. Certainly it seems to be more interesting.

The movements which Bach discusses are Jehovah's Witnesses, the Spiritualists, Father Divine, Unity, the Four Square Gospel, the

Oxford Group, Bahai and Psychiana. This leaves untouched a considerable number of equally important faiths which perhaps he may intend treating in some future volume. It may well be hoped that he does so intend. Here is information and lots of it about little known religious groups. Here is a sympathetic attempt at understanding them which stands in welcome contrast to the old tone of censure and hostility which has so often characterized the writings about them. Here is the evidence of a conviction which the reviewer himself holds, having just completed a much more extended study covering the same and many other movements, that they represent something quite significant in the history of religion of our times; that the people who belong to them are desperately in earnest; and that they are seeking ends which need not be sought, for the most part, outside the historic Christian churches. They are so sought by vast numbers of people simply because the churches have not performed an adequate ministry to the whole range of human need.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

*Northwestern University*

### Christian Ethics

*Color and Conscience: The Irrepressible Conflict.* By BUELL G. GALLAGHER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. ix + 244 pages. \$2.50.

Early in her life Dr. Gallagher's little daughter met the fact that "color caste does not permit whites the integrity of a Christian conscience." With this as the starting point, the author looks "behind the smooth facade of a social system to see color caste at work."

Now Professor of Christian Ethics at the Pacific School of Religion, Dr. Gallagher was President of Talladega College in Alabama where he had plenty of opportunity to see the caste system at work and to know the attitude of the Negro on the problem of caste. Dr. Gallagher has done more than just write another book on the race problem. He shows just how the whole Christian enterprise of church work and missions is tied up with the

problem of race. He presents the thesis, for example, that what he calls the "great defection" of the third century—the loss of north Africa to the Christian Church—was due to the "refusal of the Church of the Empire to accord equality and consideration to the churches in colonial Egypt and Africa." Islam offered racial equality and against that the exclusiveness of the Christian Church could not stand. The question then presents itself whether the Christian Church in its 20th century missionary enterprise is not facing the same challenge.

Dr. Gallagher recognizes that advances were made at the San Francisco conference of the United Nations but warns that "if the Caucasian at the peace table repeats the mistakes of Versailles and attempts once more to fasten white supremacy upon the colored world, and if Caucasian America continues to insist that this is a white man's country, it is likely that this act of defiance will be his final tragic act on the stage of history." The atom bomb, he reminds us, is here.

We are warned that "moralizing" is often used as a substitute for moral action. Moralizers are correct in assuming that aims must be redirected but they are wrong, the author insists, in assuming that the job is then accomplished. Many of us recognize that Dr. Gallagher is right when he says that statements passed in church conferences are usually "far in advance of anything which the individuals who passed them are willing to espouse on their own responsibility." The something more that is needed is in the field of social engineering—"an effort to reconstruct social structures and patterns so that it becomes less completely impossible for the individual to practice his ethical convictions."

At this point many writings become weak and vague. This is not so with this book. Dr. Gallagher goes on to point out ways in which we can put into action plans that will ultimately uproot the iniquities and inequities of racial caste. At the local level we can discard and disregard the etiquette of caste. "It costs nothing to use the terms of polite ad-



## NEW TESTAMENT ORIGIN

by GEORGE M. LAMSA

Author of "Gospel Light,"  
"Our Neighbor Jesus" etc.

Bringing new light to the ever-interesting question of Bible origins, the noted scholar and lecturer presents his theme that the original language of the New Testament was Aramaic, not Greek; and that our translations from the Greek suffer from many errors and distortions in meaning. A wealth of evidence supports the author's view. A book for the clergy, Bible teachers, and students.

\$2.00

### *The Story of Joseph, Shepherd Prince of Israel.*

"An epic tale of profound sincerity. Joseph is at last not less than the Bible portrait."

\$3.00

—Dr. Daniel A. Poling,  
*The Christian Herald*

## TABLE in the WILDERNESS

By NORTON S. PARKER

Available at all bookstores

ZIFF ★ DAVIS  
PUBLISHING COMPANY CHICAGO • NEW YORK

dress." For another thing, "our homes can become, immediately and without delay, centers of open friendship. The few friends whom we may temporarily lose will be more than offset by the rich friendship we gain." At the level of the churches we can do something. "We can make the churches in which we worship and work inclusive rather than exclusive." Dr. Gallagher goes on to point out specific things we can do on the community and sectional level in regard to newspapers, courts, police and other social agencies. Most all of these things can be done, he reminds us, without waiting for other people. They do not require much imagination or initiative. They do require a "little courage and a willingness to do what one knows is right when others laugh or talk behind one's back." This is a book that will be on one's conscience. That commends it without reservation.

VERNON P. BODEIN

*Iowa State Teachers College*

#### Religion and Social Philosophy

*Problems in Religion and Life.* By ANTON T. BOISEN. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1946. 159 pages. \$1.50.

Dr. Boisen believes that as a servant of mankind a minister must learn to read the living human documents represented in his parish. He declares that his purpose "is not to impart information but to help in the task of exploration and discovery in the realm of social and religious experience." He hopes that the action of universities and theological schools in setting up Pastors' Institutes may be supplemented by small groups of eager men digging out facts for themselves, and suggests certain studies for discussion and provides questions and propositions for consideration. He makes them provocative and controversial so that they may be thoroughly weighed and tested.

The book is divided into three parts: (1) preliminary: dealing with the community, the home and its members, the individual and his development; (2) types of maladjustment: the mentally ill, the delinquent, the sexually maladjusted, the alcoholic, the physically ill;

(3) general problems: principles of personal counselling, religious education, the religious conversion experience today, the religion of the underprivileged, moral reconversion, religion and social action, the distinctive task of the minister, the minister's library.

Dr. Boisen thinks that the fevers and inflammations of the mentally ill are not evils but manifestations of nature's power to heal. "As such they are closely related to the religious conversion experience." "Both arise out of a common situation, that of conflict between the ideal and the actual self. In both there is acute awareness of unattained possibilities, with the sense of estrangement and guilt as the primary evil. In mental disorder as well as in religious experience we may see manifestations of nature's power to heal. In religious experience as well as in mental disorder we may find pathological features. The difference lies in the outcome. When the outcome is destructive or inconclusive, we think of it as mental disorder. Where, on the other hand, it results in progressive unification and social adaptation we think of it as religious experience."

The author has made himself a leader in his field, and is largely responsible for the deeper interest of ministers in their charges as in a real sense "The cure of souls." Students along these lines will find this volume of importance. It will lead to question and sometimes to dissent. But it is timely and should be read.

JOHN GARDNER

*New York City*

*Nowhere Was Somewhere.* By ARTHUR E. MORGAN. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946. 234 pages. \$2.50.

Social planning, which has engaged much of Mr. Morgan's attention in practice, now engages his attention in theory. His major contention seems to be that behind every utopian program in literature has existed some concrete embodiment in time and space. In particular much of the volume is concerned with establishing the fact with documentary and comparative evidence that the Inca civilization of



Peru was the actual basis for Thomas More's Utopia. In this effort he succeeds admirably, compiling unassailable evidence which, taken together, appears to lift the matter beyond debate. If one has the feeling that the subject is given perhaps more attention than it deserves, he nonetheless must concede that much investigation and laborious scholarship has gone into the production, and that any point well established can become a treasure house of inference.

Unfortunately, insofar as the story of the Inca civilization is representative of all utopian narratives, one is forced to conclude that utopianism and totalitarianism are one and the same thing. Mankind seems to have before him an irrevocable choice—equality or liberty. Absolute equality in the economic sphere seems to require an equally absolute tyranny, in which the citizens are slaves and the ruler their master. We seem to be acquainted with such utopias in recent Nazi Germany and in Russia.

The real value of this volume lies in its underscoring of the place of utopian thinking, or idealistic thinking, in the re-making of men and cultures. Our own United States Constitution is an example of utopian idealism brought to embodiment. For all practical purposes, every item listed in social progress has first existed as an ideal in the mind of some lonely thinker, and before that, in partial embodiment in some previous historic situation. The purely creative element in any utopian writer has been small; his most valuable insights have been borrowed from the history of his own people, or the history of peoples aside from the main highways.

Immediate needs and desires, as they play a stimulating role in the lives of individuals, so they play a similar role in the evolution of a nation. The step just ahead, the need so keenly felt, though utopian in being as yet unrealized, is also a necessity for any advancement.

The book at its best is Platonic in its emphasis upon the seminal role in all history of ideas. Every idea, whether More's Utopia or Christ's Kingdom of Heaven, has existed first

in mind and second in history. And fortunately, as Mr. Morgan points out repeatedly, democracy is a utopia brought to history as surely as the totalitarian state pictured by More and Bellamy. Man's task seems to be fearless trial and adventure, coupled with unrelenting criticism, till the balance is found and the dream of righteousness and peace is realized.

DAVID WESLEY SOPER

*Beloit College*

### Theology

*The God We Worship.* By ROGER HAZELTON.  
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946.  
vii + 160 pages. \$2.00.

"The touchstone of reality in worship is a conviction of the real God, and . . . true belief concerning God is essential to the true worship of Him" (p. 10). Professor Hazelton, hence, is convinced theologians need worship and worshippers need theology. His convictions are expressed in language and form manifesting distinctive literary ability. Incisive sentences reveal extensive reading and mature perspective. Through the printed word the reader senses one who lives what he preaches—a thinker himself experiencing reality in worship.

The magnitude of the author's undertaking is summarized by reporting that within 160 pages are found a treatment of worship, a philosophical analysis of the holiness, power, and love of God, and a theological consideration of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Sacraments. Rooted in American liberalism, the author courageously pioneers in all those realms.

A book presuming to treat numerous basic problems with such brevity inevitably exposes itself to many attacks. Particularistic objections, however, may fail to evaluate adequately the total work.

This reviewer chooses to center attention upon method rather than content, because he believes methodological problems crucially important to American liberalism emerge from Professor Hazelton's work.

Has the author given sufficient attention to

the contemporary difficulties of attempting to steer a middle course between the theological Right and the philosophical Left? Would not his method have been highly effective in 1900, even in 1920? But what of today? Within the last quarter-century America has been invaded by Kierkegaard and his "descendants." During the same period the philosophies of Whitehead, Wieman, Dewey, and Alexander increasingly have made their impacts upon liberalism. The convergence of these antithetical streams of thought in the English-speaking nations constitutes unique problems for Protestant liberalism in those lands.

Practically all of Professor Hazelton's excellent work will be discredited by the Rightists as bespeaking too much metaphysics, not enough anthropology; too much speculative, not enough revealed theology. They will cite his rationalistic treatment of Calvin (pp. 70-79) as a case in point, contending that he does not come to grips with the problem of man's sinful nature, a nature thick keeps man from knowing the Will of God as the "supreme rule of righteousness" (Inst. III, 23, 2). God, therefore, as Goodness itself, cannot be charged with arbitrary acts.

Will not the Left regard the work as not philosophic enough and as shrinking from full epistemological dependence upon general experience? It will repudiate the marriage the author endeavors to affect between a rational-empirical epistemology and "infinite" theism. It will insist that in such a marriage conclusions predetermine methods of reaching conclusions, and will cite as examples the occasional flight into paradox. It will ask whether a "certain intractable character in both the natural world and human spirits" (78) is to be regarded ontologically as accidental or substantial, and will find parts of the book inconsistent with either answer.

This reviewer, for all his personal appreciation of this stimulating book, fears it does not convey the depths of truth its author glimpses. Sociology of knowledge reminds us that most communicative symbols are dynamic. Attention ever must be given to thought, to the

symbol, to the referent (object) the symbol represents, and, particularly, to the problem of the merely imputed relation one can establish between symbol and object. To communicate by means of the symbol "transcendent God," for example, requires, in the intellectual climate of today, careful treatment of epistemology, of the relation of reason and revelation, and of man.

Professor Hazelton's penetrating quest both for new garments with which to clothe old truth, and for new truth itself, needs more careful methodological designing.

PRENTISS L. PEMBERTON

*Cambridge, Mass.*

*Christianity Rightly So Called.* By SAMUEL G. CRAIG. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1946. viii + 270 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Craig finds many persons confused by the variety and contrary character of the movements and beliefs which are being called Christianity. He has, accordingly, devoted himself to the task of definition, surely a commendable undertaking.

The problem, he believes, is purely historical. Christianity rightly so called is what it was originally. Any religion other than that should be called by a different name (34). Original Christianity, he identifies as "essentially one with Paulinism" (39). However, he concedes later that the knowledge of Paulinism is now derived from the later life of the church, so that now "our conception of Christianity is derived from both its New Testament presentation and its whole historical manifestation" (46; cf. 39). But when he says "whole historical manifestation" he means to exclude "sects whose standing in the Christian body is questionable" (62), and he banishes to this "questionable" group all who do "not share the view of Christ that has found such classic expression in the Westminster Standards" (62).

On the other hand, the author is willing to include in "Christianity rightly so called" much that is not ideal or perfect Christianity. Though he is a self-declared Fundamentalist

(vi) and quite ready to read out of the Christian fold many who regard themselves as loyal Christians, yet he is much too humble and irenic in spirit to demand from all Christians a precise agreement with his own long creed. Falsifications of Christianity, which are no Christianity at all, are to be distinguished from deformations of Christianity. The humility and breadth of Dr. Craig's spirit appear favorably in his statement that "few things are more certain than that every confession of Christianity including our own is in some degree a deformed Christianity" (237).

The main problem of the book, then, is the defining of certain minimum requirements of Christianity. They will be normative, but they will not require perfection. When he states these requirements, as he does repeatedly in various forms, the author seems to fall considerably short of strict consistency. Sometimes he includes the pre-existence and deity of Christ, in the strictest sense (e.g. 60-62, 153). But in his list of "test questions" (244-245) by which any man can determine whether his religion is "rightly called Christianity" no such test occurs. He begins his formal definition of Christianity with the words, "Christianity is that ethical religion . . ." (87). But in the "test questions" he makes no mention of its ethical character, and he defends the omission of "the ethical test" on the ground that its application is difficult. This defense is unconvincing unless it is more important to make a distinction easy than to make it right. Moreover, it may be questioned whether it is so much easier to discover what a man sincerely believes than what he sincerely intends. In any event, it would obviously be a mistake to substitute a false definition for a true one merely because the former was believed capable of being more surely applied.

The book is written in a clear and readable, though somewhat careless style. The phrase "in as far as," occasionally written "inasfar as," appears with annoying frequency (three times on page 137 alone; cf. 190, 191, 205).

*Christianity Rightly So Called* is especially

interesting as a new demonstration of the difficulties attending the effort to define Christian doctrine in such a way as to provide a simple formula for excluding all falsifications of the Gospel without excluding any loyal Christians. Dr. Craig is not the first to attempt this task. He is not likely to be the last.

L. HAROLD DEWOLF

*Boston University School of Theology*

*The Origins of Christian Supernaturalism.* By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946. vii + 239 pages. \$3.00.

Shirley Jackson Case has devoted much of his long and very productive life to the study of early Christian supernaturalism. From the publication of his *Evolution of Early Christianity* in 1914 to the appearance of the present volume, he has focused his attention upon the factors which produced and shaped the early Christian movement, and which have determined in character, in part, to the present. One of the most significant of the early environmental factors was the world-view in which extranatural forces were believed to exercise dominant control. In 1929, Dean Case published his *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*, in which he presented detailed evidence from contemporary sources to support the view that the thought and action of the early Christians, as well as that of their contemporaries, was controlled by their belief in the presence and potency of unseen forces benevolent and malevolent in character. The present volume is a revision and extension, of content but not of pages, of the earlier volume, now long out of print.

It is Case's thesis that the supernaturalistic interpretation of Christianity was the direct result of its birth into a world dominated by a crass dualistic metaphysics. Christianity, and the other movements of its day, utilized the resources which they found available. Perhaps the most significant set of structural ideas available at the time were those which conceived of visible forces as passive and of "invis-

ible" forces as highly potent. The early Christians were probably justified in their adoption of this view of reality as the basis for the intellectual development of their faith. He finds it exceedingly difficult, however, to justify the continuance into the present of an interpretation of Christianity which is based upon a completely outmoded and discredited view of reality. His primary purpose in this volume is to point out to contemporary students of Christianity the highly temporary character of the supernaturalism which many believe to be the permanent element in it. Once an individual becomes aware of the fact that supernaturalism was the general worldview when the Christian movement originated, and that it was not a new revelation characteristic of Christianity alone, he should be able to estimate more accurately the temporary character of supernaturalism as such. A careful consideration of this volume, with some study of the sources upon which it is based, should help the educated wing of Christian leaders to escape from the thought-smothering fog of supernaturalism.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

*The Iliff School of Theology*

*Remaking the Modern Mind.* By CARL F. H. HENRY. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1946. 301 pages. \$3.00.

Dr. Henry, Professor of Philosophy of Religion at the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, has taken a careful look at the modern mind, and found it in process of profound change. This change is the abandonment of the presuppositions of the last 350 years, the years from Descartes to Dewey. The orthodoxy of modern naturalism, based as it was on the belief in a meaningless world, on sheer expediency in ethics, on sensate well-being as the chief end of man, has fallen apart into several thorough-going heresies, among them the classical heresy of the Christian faith. Contemporary man is not as sure as he was before 1914 that human progress is inevitable, that man is inherently good, that

nature is the ultimate reality, that man is solely an animal. These dogmas and myths of modern relativism have proven themselves, from 1914 to 1945, as lacking in realism. Their dominion over the human mind is at an end, whether or not neo-naturalists are aware of the fact.

Descartes was the father of recent sensate philosophy, with its chief credo of anthropocentric optimism, and Dewey its undertaker. The absolute hegemony of utilitarian instrumentalism is of archeological interest only, completely out of step with current tragic events. Mediaeval confidence in the ultimate triumph of righteousness was based upon the dual idea of man as sinner and God as Saviour, and was therefore utterly distinct from the false identification of development with goodness. Change and progress have conclusively demonstrated their possible incompatibility.

Modern psychology has established indisputably the egocentric distortion which runs like a dark thread through all tapestries of human origin. Man's egocentric will is no longer in question. In view of its reality the modern idea that man is "a good little boy" is obsolete.

The dogma of continuity and uniformity in nature has broken open into indeterminacy, and the effort to resurrect the human spirit and moral responsibility simply by the device of distinctive levels in emergent evolution is itself already within the Nessus shirt of naturalism. The modern gods, who have been substituted by nostalgic naturalists for the Sovereign Person of classical Christianity, have not entered vitally into the stream of history. They have demonstrated their essential irrelevance to the human problem, their powerless dependence upon man their creator. Man is newly thrust, by the imponderable logic of chaos, against an inescapable either/or—rational revelation of non-meaning. The Nazarene gazes into the eyes of modern men, and invites them out of the valley of despair.

Dr. Henry has managed to combine breadth of scholarship with ideological simplicity. Though somewhat cramped by the terminology



of literalism, though lacking in a degree of freshness and vitality, Dr. Henry has nonetheless penetrated into the fundamental causes of the modern tragedy, and has articulated with power the contemporary relevance of classical Christianity.

DAVID WESLEY SOPER

*Beloit College*

*A Kierkegaard Anthology.* Edited by ROBERT BRETALL. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. 487 + xxv. Price \$5.00.

The meteoric appearance of Kierkegaard in the theological heaven is one of the dramatic surprises of history. He had been there for a century waiting like a distant star until a telescope was prepared to make the discovery. He was known of course to his Danish countrymen, and then to European neighbors who acknowledged him as the leader of "existential-

ism." But it was not until this decade that he was translated into English chiefly by the Swensons and Walter Lowrie. Now that his "time" is come, we realize that other events and movements of earth and heaven have prepared the way for him. The rise and fall of other magnitudes have drawn attention to his orbit. The failure of abstract speculation, aesthetic indecision, shallow optimism, totalitarianism, external ritualism, ethical compromise, and the darkness that descends in their wake—make his star the more luminous.

For Kierkegaard is a protestant against these well known magnitudes. His polemic strips away many a veil of illusion, and with rare penetration discloses deeper realities. He takes extreme positions against popular tendencies of our shallow culture and shows the tragedy of false pretensions and easy adjustments. He stirs up controversy, gives rise to anger, appeals to absurdity ("the only thing

**NOW!**

**The sixteenth volume of the  
Moffatt New Testament Commentary  
JOHANNINE EPISTLES**

*by C. H. DODD*

This famous commentary on the entire New Testament in the Moffatt translation now lacks but one volume to complete it. Here the eminent author of the *Epistle of Paul to the Romans* provides a penetrating exposition and introduction to the Fourth

Gospel. The Alumni Review of McCormick Theological Seminary says of the new book: "Marked by a fresh vigor and high quality, and deserves wide use, his commentary is deserving of thoughtful study." \$2.75

*at your bookseller*

**HARPER & BROTHERS • 49 EAST 33rd STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.**

that can save him is the absurd," p. 126), and uses faith as an "offense" against reason. Where we would reconcile he opposes mediation, and we protest he goes too far in his extremes. We demand understanding to harmonize faith and reason, he insists upon using "the understanding to believe against the understanding" (p. xxiv). He does not intend to state the whole truth, but to be a corrective against falsehood. As such, like Socrates, he performs a service more needed than appreciated.

Robert Bretall serves a need for which he will be appreciated in preparing this authoritative anthology of Kierkegaard. To readers who have lost the forest among the trees of separate volumes and discourses, this anthology will bring perspective and direction urgently needed. The selections are not tidbits of unrelated curiosity but larger units well joined together as "fragments" in chronological order to give the progression of thought and growth in Kierkegaard. Passages are omitted necessarily that one might like to include, but what is gathered up in this one volume is sufficient to give the essence and the flavor of the real existential thing. The perceptive introduction, the biographical prefaces to each selection, the key sentences interspersed from the *Journals*, and the footnotes cast light upon the scene and aid in seeing the significance of details in the whole picture. The portrait on the frontispiece and the Bibliography of works by and about Kierkegaard in English add their contribution to the completeness of a classic volume, a prize to the lover of literature or religious devotion.

PAUL E. JOHNSON

*Boston University*

### The Bible

*The One Volume Bible Commentary.* Edited by J. R. DUMMELOW. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945. CLIII + 1092 pages.

The popularity of this commentary is indicated by its numerous reprintings since its original publication date, 1909. Hence this

report is not intended so much as review as a reminder. Written by 43 scholars its scholarly value is evident as one reviews names like Kennett, Lofthouse, McFadyen, Robinson and Wade in the Old Testament and Findlay, Nairne, Peake, Plummer and Ropes in the New Testament. The contributors though mainly English and Scotch, are also Canadian and American. Thus a wide range of Biblical writers is represented and each name is notable.

There are 23 general articles which provide much information though often these articles are briefer than they should be for thorough discussion. Doubtless the writers were limited in space and have therefore given concise results. Since articles and commentaries on each book are not signed by the author, the reader faces no influence of a famous name in his estimate on a particular discussion of a debatable point. Since there is no revision of articles the progress in Biblical studies since 1909 is not shown. For example the great advances in Biblical archaeology or the more recent theories like form criticism or neo-orthodoxy or the various interesting translations like Moffatt, Goodspeed and American Revised nowhere appear in these pages. Though the Authorized or King James Version is the basic text the Revised Version is also used. But essentially this commentary appeals to those who desire explanation of the classic English text and a middle of the road theology.

Each book of the Bible receives a compact introduction which deals with title, contents, authorship, date, characteristics and religious value. The chapters are usually provided with headings and the quotations of Scripture stand out in heavy black type and thus aid the reader to find his way and to distinguish comments from Scripture. Like all good commentaries this volume contains an encyclopedic amount of information and religious interpretation from learned judicious scholars. It can still be heartily recommended. For study today the need is not so much to supplant this material as to supplement by the scholarly ad-

vances of nearly forty years. These Biblical advances are imperative for the newer knowledge of the student and advisable for advancement of the layman.

The closing pages of the commentary contain a set of needed maps but these maps are almost too dark to shed much light on the areas portrayed.

DWIGHT MARION BECK

*Syracuse University*

*How to Read the Bible.* By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. Philadelphia and Toronto: The John C. Winston Company, 1946. ix + 244 pages. \$2.50.

This book, one of eleven written by Dr. Goodspeed since his "retirement," is no new venture into the field of presenting the results of Biblical scholarship to the general reading public, since his "Story of the New Testament" appeared in 1916. With his translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha and a host of other works, ranging from "Die Aeltesten Apologeten" (Göttingen, 1914) to "The Curse in the Colophon" (Chicago, 1935), he has long since established himself as one of the foremost Biblical interpreters of our time.

In this volume Dr. Goodspeed approaches the Biblical library (including the Apocrypha) from the viewpoint of literary types, beginning with the gospels as most interesting and important. This is in contrast to the chronological arrangement of his "Story of the New Testament," "Story of the Old Testament," and "Introduction to the New Testament."

The twenty-three chapters of this work cover all the standard types of literature in the Bible, from biographies to visions and revelations. The reader will find many new vistas opened to him. Galatians, for example, is discussed as an oration (p. 34) as well as an epistle. The importance of oratory in both testaments is rightfully emphasized on p. 24, where he says of the Hebrews, "Their whole literary expression was dominated and colored by the spoken word."

It is inevitable that some books will be

treated under several classifications. Daniel is given two pages (151 and 152) under "Fiction," but five pages under "Visions and Revelations" (192-196); the latter section is an excellent guide through the maze of mysteries in this book. Luke appears in the chapter, "Where to Begin," and under "Biographies" and "Later Histories." Rather than confusing the reader, this treatment helps him to appreciate the many-sidedness of the books in question.

As usual, Dr. Goodspeed's writing is lucid, vivid, and attractive. He calls the great section of scripture from Genesis through First Kings, "An ancient Jewish encyclopedia, embodying their traditions, beliefs, and laws and tracing their history down to the middle of the Exile in Babylon." With a well-turned phrase he often lights up an old truth, as in his comment on 1 Cor. 9 (p. 173), "Paul shows that there is sometimes a better use for one's rights than to insist on them."

Some of the author's distinctive conclusions are, of course, included in this book, although obviously his purpose in writing it was not mainly to popularize them. Among them are his belief that Philemon is the letter to the Laodiceans (p. 179), and that Ephesians was written by a follower of Paul to introduce the apostle's collected letters.

Although it was manifestly impossible to include everything, one misses a discussion of Abraham under the Biographies, and the treatment of the Ezra apocalypse (p. 179) might have been fuller.

Chapter XX, "The Literature of Devotion," as well as many another section, reveals Dr. Goodspeed as no mere *littérateur*, but as an expert in the field of religious and moral values as well. Chapter XXI furnishes a "Historical Background," and the next one affords an outline for "Chronological Reading." Finally, there is an excellent chapter on "English Bibles."

Throughout, Dr. Goodspeed sends his readers directly to the Biblical text, better equipped with an understanding of the background and

meaning of what they read. This is a measure of the value of this book, and a reason for the wide distribution it has already attained.

F. WILBUR GINGRICH

*Albright College*

*Prophetic Religion.* By J. PHILIP HYATT. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947. 188 pages. \$1.75.

In spite of all that has been written concerning the Hebrew prophets, they continue to invite further scrutiny. That is why fresh studies in the prophets are always welcome to lovers of the Old Testament. The present volume, which "aims to discover the basic characteristics of prophetic religion," is a happy illustration of this fact. As his sources Professor Hyatt takes the seven greatest Old Testament prophets, and Jesus, whom he rightly regards as a prophet, though recognizing that He far transcends that category. After giving a short sketch of the external facts about each of the seven (Ch. 1), he proceeds to his theme. His divisions of the subject at once elicit the reader's interest: The Called of God, The Prophetic Criticism of Life, The Prophetic View of History (past and present and future), The Prophets and Ritualism, The Patriotism of the Prophets, The God of the Prophets, The Prophetic View of Sin and Forgiveness.

In general, this is a strong and thoughtful book, characterized by acquaintance with the recent literature, a painstaking study of the sources, clarity of presentation, sound reasoning (even where one disagrees with him), sensible conservatism in critical views (except perhaps as to Ezekiel), and sincere religious sympathy with the prophets and Jesus. One of its most helpful features is the consideration of Jesus' teaching under each of the divisions.

As to particulars, the reviewer must content himself with listing a few of the many things he would like to say. In treating the prophets and ritualism the author ranges himself definitely with those scholars who believe that the pre-exilic prophets wanted "the whole sacrificial and ritualistic system and practices of their

day" to be abolished, though he attributes to Jesus a different attitude: to Jesus' mind "the offering of gifts on an altar in a temple was not in itself an offense to a holy God, but the worshipers must put first things first" (p. 131). He is right in maintaining that the prophets were not social reformers or the champions of any class, though he brings out clearly that they did demand the just and kind treatment of the poor. As to prediction, he declares that the prophets did to a real extent foretell the future, though it is a question whether he quite does justice to this element of prediction. The prophets, he says, "did not predict detailed events and precise dates, but proclaimed moral laws and religious truths valid for all time" (p. 117). One wishes that he had made more of the massive prophetic looking forward to a redemption to come, which was fulfilled in Jesus. In discriminating secondary from primary material, he very sensibly refuses to rule out all passages of hope as authentic; although he makes it clear that the task of the critic is difficult. He accepts the new covenant prophecy (Jer. 31:31ff) as Jeremiah's, characterizing it as "a Magna Charta of personal religion" (p. 107). He thinks that Jesus, in His view of the future," was much more definitely within the *prophetic* than the *apocalyptic* tradition" (p. 112). The prophets, he believes, were patriotic, though not in the usual way, for they sought the *total* welfare of all within the state and of foreign peoples also. (One questions whether the latter is true of Hosea or Isaiah). They were not pacifists in the modern sense, but they opposed foreign alliances, armaments, and revolts as futile and displaying lack of trust in God. Their idea of God, he correctly maintains, they got from Moses, though they corrected, deepened, and widened the Hebrew understanding of God's nature. Sin they viewed as rebellion against God, even when it was an offense against other men; it could come only from corruption in men's hearts. It called for repentance, which God would meet with forgiveness, asking no sacrifices.

These scattered remarks, however, give no



adequate idea of Professor Hyatt's views. For a treatment so full of thought the reader must be referred to the book itself.

FLEMING JAMES

North Haven, Conn.

### Jesus

*A Plain Man's Life of Christ.* By A. D. MARTIN. With a prefatory note by Professor Sydney Cave. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. \$2.00.

The author of this book, who died in 1940, was an English Congregational minister and author of several books in addition to the one under discussion, including a book on *The Holiness of Jesus*. This "plain man's" life of Jesus is a well written book and well adapted to use by undergraduate college students and by laymen. Acceptance of the liberal viewpoint is indicated by reference in notes to such names as Montefiore, Manson, Burney, Burkitt, E. F. Scott, and C. H. Dodd. The book presents no startling departures from the liberal portrait of Jesus, except perhaps in an apparent readiness to credit Jesus with psychic powers not usually stressed in liberal lives of Jesus. "Jesus is not strictly speaking classifiable . . . he had more likeness to an Oriental mystic than to a Western scientist or philosopher. Many of his recorded actions, which we have no reason at all to doubt, resemble telepathies and second sight" (p. 28).

Another line of Dr. Martin's interests, in addition to that in biblical scholarship, appears in references to the names of such literary figures as Alice Meynell, William Blake, F. W. H. Myers, Matthew Arnold, and Wordsworth. This interest of the writer plays a prominent part in his interpretation of the teachings of Jesus, where he follows Burney extensively in arguing for the poetic form of many of Jesus' sayings, and beyond that, for the poetic, imaginative cast of Jesus' mind as opposed to legalistic interpretations of Jesus' viewpoint. This cue to the understanding of Jesus is applied effectively to the parable of the

sheep and the goats in Matthew, chapter 25, to argue that the element of hope is here intertwined with the prophecy of doom. "We feel that no man could, or ought to, employ the lingering sweetness of deliberately chosen assonances, if actually he is foreshewing the doom of everlasting punishment to any of his fellow mortals" (pp. 40-41). Any work of art is *ipso facto* the product of a matured mind and represents the mastery of experience. Tennyson, for example, could not write his *In Memoriam* until 17 years after the death of his friend, Arthur Hallam, by which time he had come to see the positive meanings of that friendship, despite the tragic loss. So, too, the fact that Jesus expressed himself in the language of a poet leads one to look in his utterances for a mature breadth and understanding, for "the quality of mercy," even in a parable of judgment. When we realize that this passage (Matthew 25) in its English dress is a prose rendering of a rhymed Aramaic poem, we cannot dissociate a final hope from its language of condemnation, terrible though that language may be" (p. 40).

Throughout the book, Dr. Martin uses only the synoptic gospels as sources. This imposes a rather severe handicap upon his treatment of the resurrection where he makes only a brief reference to Paul's reference to the early tradition in I Corinthians 15 and limits himself to the empty tomb theory.

The book as a whole is well worth reading. It gives the mature reflections upon the life of Jesus of one who has given a lifetime to the study and interpretation of the Christian faith. The writer has a mastery of good English style.

CARL E. PURINTON

Boston University

### New Testament Greek

*Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek.* By BRUCE M. METZGER. Published by the author, Princeton, N. J., 1946. viii + 110 pages, lithoprinted. \$1.00.

This useful little book is divided into two

main parts, with three appendices. Part I contains the 1052 words of the Greek New Testament which occur ten times or more, arranged in groups according to frequency. With each word is given its meaning and a derivative, if it has the latter.

The derivatives are a great help to the student in learning his vocabulary. Some of them given here are exotic but theologically useful, and they are accompanied by explanations when these are necessary.

A casual survey shows that derivatives are lacking in the book for these words: *τίθημι* (p. 16), *φυλάσσω* (26), *δένδρον* (29), *κατηγορέω* (30), *καταλύω* (36), *διψάω* (37), *συνίστημι* (37), *ἀνατολή* (48), and *δύναμαι* (110). A useful addition to this section would be an alphabetical list of the words, indicating the frequency under which they may be found.

Part II utilizes the very useful method of grouping words which are related by common etymology, often tracing them to a common root. It is prefaced by an excellent account of word-formation in Greek. The treatment is based on the Moulton-Howard Grammar, and on the etymological dictionaries of Prellwitz and Boisacq.

Appendix I deals with the Indo-European family of languages, including a valuable statement on Grimm's Law and cognate words. This section will help to give the student a much-needed orientation in the field of general linguistics.

The second appendix treats prepositions in composition with verbs, and the third is a table of correlative pronouns and adverbs.

When this book is published in permanent form, as it deserves to be, it might profitably contain a summary of the characteristics of Hellenistic Greek, with New Testament illustrations.

F. WILBUR GINGRICH

*Albright College*

### Christian Education

*The Modern Parent and the Teaching Church.*

By WESNER FALLAW. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. xvi + 228 pages. \$2.50.

*The Church and Christian Education.* By

PAUL H. VIETH, Ed. Saint Louis: The Bethany Press, 1947. 314 pages. \$2.50.

*The Church as Educator.* By CONRAD H.

MOEHLMAN. New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, Inc., 1947. ix + 184 pages. \$2.00.

These three books, along with Professor Ernest J. Chave's fine volume, *A Functional Approach to Religious Education*, indicate that today there is a good deal of creative thinking going on in the field of religious education. Fallaw's book is a genuine contribution to the effort to solve the complex problem of providing Protestant America with adequate education in religion. It will give the professional teacher of religion some ideas with which he must deal. It is the book I would recommend to local churchmen who wish to think through to a realistic program for the local church. Professor Fallaw has not attempted to outline a complete Protestant strategy in dealing with religious education. However, he has done much more than deal simply with religion in the home, as the title might indicate. He has attempted to state a philosophy of religious education for the local church in so far as its responsibilities are confined to its own constituency. His theses are that effective religious education is in fact a family matter, and that the Sunday School should be "the agency for high lighting and underscoring through-the-week religious instruction rendered by the family. . . . The Sunday School cannot underscore what the modern home has failed to write into the record."

*The Church and Christian Education* is based on the deliberations of a large and distinguished committee set up by the International Council of Religious Education to study Christian

education. The Committee issued technical studies on the following topics: "The Local Church," "The Family," "Leadership," "Christian Education—Yesterday and Today," "Theological and Educational Foundations." Professor Vieth presents in *The Church and Christian Education* "a more popular statement," rewriting "these reports where necessary for the purpose of this volume," and creating "new material where points seemed to be needed with which the committee had not dealt." The volume will serve as an introductory and orienting statement for those who wish to be made aware of the conditions prevailing in present-day religious education and of the attitudes of present-day religious educators. The book should prove especially useful for lay reading. "The critical reader is advised to examine the complete reports of the 'Study,' in addition to reading this book."

The title of Professor Moehlman's book is not sufficiently descriptive. The book deals with much more than the educational program of the church. "This study is designed to put the religious phase of the breakdown of the medieval religious synthesis and the birth of the modern religious synthesis in proper per-

spective. It examines in broad outline that breakdown, paying special attention to four major trends: racialism, the evangelization of the world in this generation, the failure of two attempts to compromise, namely the American social gospel and religious education.

"Dealing, thereupon, with the American landscape, it shows how the new synthesis has won the war in American education against ecclesiastical reaction in both the university and public school areas. The released time experiment is seen to be the final feeble attempt of ecclesiastical ignorance to guide the American way of life.

"The third section of the analysis is concerned with various suggestions looking toward a formulation of the new synthesis in practical terms."

Professor Moehlman does have a good many pages dealing with religious education but I have the feeling that there is a considerable amount of educational material which he leaves out of account in making his judgments. The weight of his argument is an attack on supernaturalism. The book is pungently written.

J. PAUL WILLIAMS

*Mount Holyoke College*

## Book Notices

*Thou Preparest a Table.* By WILLIAM C. SKEATH.  
New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury  
Press. 128 pages. \$1.00.

The author is a Methodist minister at Norristown, Pa. He has written a series of brief meditations on the incidents connected with the last supper as recorded in the four gospels. Each theme is dealt with reverently, and in such a way as to prepare the mind and heart of the participant in the Lord's Supper. There are many beautiful quotations and illustrations to emphasize the lessons taught.

JOHN GARDNER

*New York City*

*Finding God through Christ.* By CHARLES EDWARD FORLINES. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 207 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Forlines belonged to the Methodist Protestant Church, and was president of the Theological Seminary at Westminster, Maryland. An appreciative foreword

by Richard L. Shipley and biographic sketch of the author by Fred Garrigus Holloway bear witness to the respect and affection in which he was held. Eight chapters deal with the Christian Message, and seven with the Christian Messenger. The series on the Christian Message reveals a well-informed mind, orthodox in view point. Each theme is built as though by a logician. The attempt to define the presence of two natures in Jesus Christ, whereby at one moment He assumes the knowledge, power and judgment of deity, and at another moment He is a man struggling with life's problems, exposes him to serious criticism. It is in the second half of the book dealing with the Messenger, that with a warmth of feeling a real understanding of the mission of the preacher stands forth. We have found stimulus and challenge in reading this book.

JOHN GARDNER

*New York City.*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued from page 129)

#### BOOK NOTICES:

SKEATH, WILLIAM C., *THOU PREPAREST A TABLE*..... 192

FORLINES, CHARLES EDWARD..... 192  
By John Gardner

#### THE ASSOCIATION:

THE MIDWESTERN MEETING..... 193



---

# The Association

---

## THE MIDWESTERN MEETING

The Ninth Annual Meeting of the Midwestern N.A.B.I. was convened by the president, Professor Carl E. Purinton, at 7:30 p.m.

The program was formally received; the chairman of the committee on Program, Professor H. T. Houf, was recognized and deputized by the president to preside at the program sessions of the Meeting. Professor Forster of the host seminary spoke a welcome, to which the president of Midwestern responded. These committees were appointed by the chair: on Nominations, Professors Filson, Mihelic, Kraft; on Policy, Professors King, Braden, Davies; on Resolutions, Professor Conover.

The Presidential Address on "Theology, Literature and Life" by Professor Carl E. Purinton of Boston University initiated the program.

Two papers, "Reason in Religion" by Professor W. H. Bernhardt and "Liberalism and the Challenge of Neo-Orthodoxy" by Professor R. M. Montgomery elicited a lively discussion.

The meeting recessed till 9:00 a.m., Saturday.

The second session with Professor Houf presiding, included papers on "Aspects of Religion in Jeremiah", J. T. Veneklasen; "Conduct Objectives in Teaching the Old Testament", L. B. Hazzard; "Conduct Objectives in Teaching the New Testament", R. R. Brewer; "Christian Ethics and Contemporary Social Issues", H. H. Titus; "Experimenting with a New Curriculum in Religion", H. F. Baty.

The meeting recessed till 1:30 p.m., after motion had prevailed to hold further sessions at Garrett Biblical Institute in the interest of greater space (the invitation from Professor Blair of Garrett after consultation with Professor Forster of Seabury), at which time Professor C. S. Braden read a paper, "Recent Enrollment Trends in Religious Courses".

The Business session was called to order by Professor Purinton at 1:55.

Minutes of the last Meeting were accepted as printed in the Journal.

No report was made by committees on "Curriculum" or "Junior Colleges."

Report of the committee on Nominations was received and the secretary, by instruction, cast a unanimous ballot for the following new officers:

President, H. T. Houf, *Ohio University*.

Vice-president, E. P. Blair, *Garrett Biblical Institute*.  
Secretary, W. E. Hunter, 214 W. 52nd Street, Chicago, Ill.

Program chairman, L. B. Hazzard, *Illinois Wesleyan University*.

Council: N. B. Johnson, *Knox College*, Galesburg, Illinois.

The report of the committee on Policy was accepted:—

"1. We affirm the desirability of an over-all organization of the N.A.B.I.

"2. We recommend that, at least, two National officials be of a lengthened tenure, treasurer and editor of the Journal.

"3. We favor regional organizations, with their annual meetings.

"4. We favor National Annual Meetings' being associated with Regional meetings, and rotating among them: otherwise, National Meetings of less frequency than at present, though not fewer than one in four years.

"5. We recommend enlarging program time—five half-day sessions.

"6. We recommend a National Meeting in Chicago, Christmas period, 1948."

A motion (Filson, Braden) prevailed that the thirty-three professors, nominated by attendants at this Meeting, be declared members, their membership conditioned only on their forwarding applications and dues.

Invitation was accepted from the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois to meet there, January 16-17, 1948.

Report of the committee on Resolutions was accepted (see appended).

The Business session was adjourned.

President F. V. Filson of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research assumed the chair, and that part of the program, provided by that society, proceeded:—"The Unity of the Bible", J. C. Rylaarsdam; "Social Ethics in the Talmud", L. L. Mann; "The Outlook for Field Work in the Near East", J. A. Wilson.

The meeting stood adjourned after dinner at 6:00 p.m., in Scott Hall on the campus of Northwestern University.

WILLIAM E. HUNTER,  
Secretary